

CHURCH HISTORY

SEPTEMBER, 1967

Anabaptism: Abolitive Counter-Revolt
Within the Reformation

Lowell H. Zuck

The Condemnation of the Sillon: An Episode in the
History of Christian Democracy in France

Charles Breunig

The Sacramental Presuppositions of Anselm's
Cur Deus Homo

George Huntston Williams

The Catholic Reform in the Sixteenth Century

George H. Tavad



Published by
THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

FOUNDED BY PHILIP SCHAFF, 1889; REORGANIZED, 1906; INCORPORATED BY ACT
OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NEW YORK, 1916.

OFFICERS FOR 1957

H. Shelton Smith	President	Robert S. Michaelsen	Asst. Sec.
George H. Williams	Vice-President	Guy S. Klett	Treasurer
Winthrop S. Hudson	Secretary	J. H. Nichols	Editors
(Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York)		Frederick A. Norwood	

OTHER VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Sandford Fleming	Quirinus Breen
Sidney E. Mead	Robert T. Handy
Carl E. Schneider	Jerald C. Brauer
Leonard J. Trinterud	Harold J. Grimm

ADVISORY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Henry B. Washburn	Roland H. Bainton
William Walker Rockwell	E. R. Hardy, Jr.
Winfrad E. Garrison	Harold S. Bender
William Warren Sweet	Percy V. Norwood
Conrad H. Moehlmann	Kenneth S. Latourette
Frederick W. Loetscher	Matthew Spinka
John T. McNeill	Cyril W. Richardson
Wilhelm Pauck	Ernest G. Schiebert
Massey H. Shepherd	Ray C. Petry

Subscription prices are five dollars a year, one dollar and a half for single copies. Twenty-five cents a year should be added for foreign countries. Remittances should be made to the order of the American Society of Church History. Subscriptions, renewals, changes of address, claims for missing numbers, orders for single copies of current or back issues should be addressed to Guy S. Klett, Presbyterian Historical Society, 520 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania. Claims for missing numbers will be honored without charge if made within two months following the regular month of publication.

Manuscripts and books for review should be sent to the editorial office, 306 Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.

The articles in *CHURCH HISTORY* are indexed in the *International Index to Periodicals*.

Microfilm reproductions of *CHURCH HISTORY*, beginning with Volume XVIII, are available to subscribers and to members of the Society from University Microfilms, 313 North First Street, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

The Publication Office is in Berne, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter March 9, 1934, at the post-office at Berne, Indiana, under the Acts of March 3, 1879.

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NERWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Meadville Theo-
logical School*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

JOHN DILLENBERGER (*Divinity School,
Harvard University*)

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (*Princeton
Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXVI

SEPTEMBER, 1957

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ANABAPTISM: ABORTIVE COUNTER-REVOLT WITHIN THE REFORMATION <i>Lowell H. Zuck</i>	211
THE CONDEMNATION OF THE SILLON: AN EPISODE IN THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN-DEMOCRACY IN FRANCE <i>Charles Breunig</i>	227
THE SACRAMENTAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF ANSELM'S CUR DEUS HOMO <i>George Huntston Williams</i>	245
THE CATHOLIC REFORM IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY <i>George H. Tavard</i>	275
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	289
MEETING OF THE COUNCIL	291

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

292

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Bread, Fish, and Wine* Robert M. Grant

S. L. GREENSLADE: *Early Latin Theology*.....Robert M. Grant

PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER: *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*
..... Quirinus Breen

HENRI MEYLAN: *Epîtres du Coq à L'ane* Roland H. Bainton

J. W. F. HILL: *Tudor and Stuart Lincoln* Alan Simpson

PAUL H. HARDACRE: *The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution*
..... William Haller

GRETE MECENSEFFY: *Geschichte des Protestantismus in Österreich*
..... Robert Friedmann

RAYMOND G. COWHERD: *The Politics of English Dissent* Horton Davies

JOHN R. WEINLICK: *Count Zinzendorf* Don Yoder

EMIL OBERHOLZER, JR.: *Delinquent Saints: Disciplinary Action in the Early Congregational Churches of Massachusetts* Verne D. Morey

JOHANNES VAN DEN BERG: *Constrained by Jesus' Love: An Inquiry into the Motives of the Missionary Awakening in Great Britain in the Period between 1698 and 1815* R. Pierce Beaver

ANABAPTISM: ABORTIVE COUNTER-REVOLT WITHIN THE REFORMATION

LOWELL H. ZUCK, *Eden Theological Seminary*

Within the past thirty years a painstaking literature has been produced by the descendants of the sixteenth century Anabaptists, mostly Mennonites, in an effort to replace the traditional European interpretation of Anabaptism as fanaticism beginning with the revolutionary mystic, Thomas Muentzer, and ending with the revolutionary-polygamous debacle at Muenster in Westphalia ten years later.¹ Thus were the Anabaptists discredited for centuries by Lutheran and Reformed theologians within the majority churches of Europe, the American Anabaptist historians say.²

The newer American literature on Anabaptism, based carefully on sources and writings of the Anabaptists themselves, has contributed a significant apologetic for the stability of these much maligned folk. Many articles in *Church History* and the *Mennonite Quarterly Review* have made possible a much more accurate evaluation of these once neglected "step-children" of the Reformation.³

It is the feeling of the writer, however, that this American Anabaptist apologetic has been so selective as to obscure the more general situation in regard to radical religious groups during the Reformation period, of which the movement favored by the Mennonites was only a part. We in America are well aware of the importance and success of the subsequent Baptist movement in our country. Indeed, our present President is by birth and childhood training a descendant of the Anabaptists, as was his predecessor. But we have much less historical understanding of the very different environment in which Anabaptism first began as a sixteenth century movement.

I have attempted in my dissertation to support the claim that the first Anabaptists were revolutionary in attitude and act.⁴ Admittedly, the term "revolutionary" is ambiguous and controversial when applied to any aspect of the Reformation. In the eyes of the Roman Catholics, all Reformers were revolutionaries.⁵ Luther regarded the Roman church as revolutionary, since it had departed from the Scriptural and apostolic norms and was only four hundred years old.⁶ Luther also regarded Zwingli and the Anabaptists, both in Wittenberg and Zuerich, as revolutionary.⁷ Zwingli wrote against the Anabaptists as revolutionaries.⁸ Some of the Anabaptists regarded Luther and Zwingli as revolutionary.⁹ All of the Reformers were in some sense

revolutionary, whether they allowed violence against their enemies, or merely desired radical change.¹⁰ But the differences among the Reformers in regard to revolution can be established most easily by reference to whether they were abortive, unsuccessful counter-revolutionaries, or whether they were established, successful revolutionaries. I am using the term "revolutionary" when referring to the Anabaptists in the peculiar sense that they were among the unsuccessful counter-revolutionaries of the Reformation.¹¹ In addition, I regard the Anabaptists as being revolutionary so far as their enthusiastic pattern of radical change appeared to their contemporaries to entail the destruction of the church and the annihilation of the state. This counter-revolutionary pattern, though tending toward and frequently resulting in violence, was often combined with consistent non-resistance, which contemporaries regarded as equally revolutionary.¹² The feasibility or ultimate worth of these proposals is not here under consideration. The way they were regarded is under consideration.

A word also should be said in reference to the definition of the term "Anabaptist." It is usually narrowly defined to include only those who were actually baptized a second time (the meaning of the Greek term) and at the same time is defined to exclude any of the re-baptized who resorted to physical violence in furthering their cause.¹³ This definition is the result of what pacifist Mennonites have decided an Anabaptist must be. All Anabaptists who follow this pattern are carefully studied and reported upon by American Mennonite scholars, but any who follow a slightly different pattern are ignored by Mennonite scholars and are not recognized by them as Anabaptists. The Muenster rebellion, for example, is simply forgotten when this approach is used, even though at least 1400 citizens of Muenster were re-baptized within eight days during early January 1534.¹⁴

The writer regards this definition as inadequate for interpreting all of the ideas and motives involved in the Anabaptist movement, though he is aware that some arbitrariness is always necessary to define a movement filled with irrepressible non-conformity. Although in a sense it may be more confusing, a broader use of the term "Anabaptist," comparable as to inclusiveness to the term "Left-Wing Reformation," allows for more comprehensive interpretation of the various ideas and individual differences springing up within the movement. As I have already stated, it appears to me that at least for the first decade the Anabaptists were those of a religious motivation, either non-resistant or violent, who attempted unsuccessfully to reform the leading Reformers.

In their day these people were regarded as the most heinous of revolutionaries, since they advocated the replacement of not only the

Roman Catholic church, but also the overthrow of the leading Reformers by vigorous conversion efforts, if not necessarily by violence. If banished they would not stay away, since the earth was the Lord's. Unlike the other Reformers they would recognize no territorial delimitations for religion, and they regarded their Protestant and Catholic opponents as enemies to the faith, not as acknowledged colleagues. Moreover, the officially induced horror toward the Anabaptists was intensified because they appeared disloyal to the state as well, either refusing any oaths and military service and thereby denying allegiance to the state, or attempting to establish their own government instead of the established state, as in the case of Muentzer and the later Anabaptist city of Muenster. Thus, actual re-baptism is not the best early test for the presence of Anabaptism as I have broadly defined it, since baptism was admittedly *not* the chief issue, and because by the time re-baptism was actually begun and was legally condemned, the movement was already thoroughly defensive after having felt the initial process of suppression.¹⁵ Not all of the counter-revolutionaries who condemned infant baptism had the immediate inclination or courage to re-baptize in the face of probable martyrdom, though those who did and those who did not (among the counter-revolutionaries) probably differed very little. Other critics of infant baptism, like Zwingli, at first agreed with the counter-revolutionaries on baptism, but did not practice re-baptism. They were obviously not counter-revolutionary. It must have been quite easy, on the other hand, for a counter-revolutionary who had little martyr spirit to say "We must save our party for more important issues and occasions than this." Admittedly, Grebel appears more admirable from a Christian ethical standpoint than Muentzer, in this regard. Yet the differences between Muentzer, who later claimed that he cared very little for any baptism, and Grebel, who risked his life to re-baptize, appear more accidental than essential. This view is supported also by the fact that all of the later Muenster violent revolutionaries had been re-baptized, and were otherwise comparable to Grebel and Muentzer, an indication that all of the initial counter-revolutionaries would also have been re-baptized had their movement been allowed to get off to a better start.

One risks additional confusion if some of the spiritualists and mystics of the Reformation period are treated as counter-revolutionaries, since in their frequent lack of concern for outward acts of reform spiritualists appear very different from those Anabaptists who were either adamantly non-resistant or irrepressibly violent.¹⁶ In principle, however, many of the spiritualists and mystics could be just as negative toward the main Reformers and the Roman Catholics as were the more active Anabaptists, and some of them might be included

within this category as well.¹⁷ Who can say that an inner attitude of rejection is always less effective in gaining its desired ends than is resolute denunciation and direct action to achieve the goal envisaged? Most of the Anabaptists tried to attain their visionary hopes and failed. The dissatisfied spiritualists and mystics did not usually make outward efforts for radical reform and in the sixteenth century no changes occurred in the direction they desired.¹⁸ The result was the same in both cases: to do nothing was as successful as to practice non-violence or foment a violent revolution. Thus, I have somewhat arbitrarily defined Anabaptism in reference to impotent opposition, even if it did not always result in external action, rather than in reference to the more external doctrinal formulations or sacramental acts. The problem in regard to mystics and spiritualists is to detect opposition to Reform, if it had no external manifestation!

So far as the actuality of revolution itself is concerned, apart from the important doctrinal issues of the Reformation period, there is no reason why counter-revolution does not have as much right to take over control of the church bodies as does the original revolution.¹⁹ Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin could not see the logic of this, though the Catholics were quick to point out (as they still do) that once one revolts against the church, possibilities are endless for further rebellions.²⁰ The difficulty in the Reformation was that the leaders of each party could and did honestly say, "There is only one truth about faith, and I have it."²¹

The actual historical facts, however, are that the original revolutionaries, the leading Reformers, had sufficient self-confidence and strength to crush the counter-revolutionaries, the Anabaptists, in spite of the fact that and perhaps because neither the Catholics nor the original revolutionaries could wipe out each other.²² Thus, the Catholics and the original revolutionaries both agreed that the counter-revolutionaries were especially dangerous, and thus their persecution took on something of the character of the old Hebrew use of the scapegoat, forced to bear the sins which were really the responsibility of each member of the new community of religious organizations.

The *first* indispensable characteristic of the sixteenth century Anabaptism is, therefore, its *desperate defensiveness as an outlawed movement*. No Jews in medieval ghettos nor "capitalist imperialists" in the U.S.S.R. today nor Communists in contemporary America could feel more rejection and defensiveness than did the sixteenth century Anabaptists.

It is this characteristic of their being universally regarded as despised counter-revolutionaries which has emboldened me to suggest the great similarity between Thomas Muentzer, a violent Thuringian

revolutionary, and Conrad Grebel, a non-resistant leader of the Swiss Anabaptists, and this in spite of the fact that Mennonite historians vehemently deny any possible connection.²³ Muentzer and Grebel were rather different in background, training, and temperament.²⁴ But they were alike in extreme individualism, therefore making evident their differences. Grebel not only sought advice, but he also volunteered some to Muentzer, in regard to non-violence and the proper Biblical form of the church, an indication of the extremely individualistic and non-conformist character of Reformation counter-revolutionaries.²⁵ Because of his vagaries, no group (except the Marxists) wishes to claim Muentzer as a father, though Roland Bainton suggests that he fathered many of the basic ideas of New England Puritanism.²⁶ Grebel has been promoted as the "founder of the Swiss Brethren" because he was apparently the first to re-baptize during the Reformation period, had some winsomeness of person, and agreed with present-day Mennonite doctrines on war, the state, oaths, and so forth.²⁷ It is clear, however, that both Muentzer and Grebel were unsuccessful leaders of the counter-revolutionary movements in the environment of the two chief centers of the early Reformation, Wittenberg and Zuerich.²⁸ They were common in situation. It is also clear that, after his defeat by Zwingli, the somewhat epigonous Zuerich counter-revolutionary, Grebel, sought comradeship and advice from his more fiery German counterpart, Muentzer.²⁹ They were common in seeking interchange of radical ideas.

At this point, however, it must be made clear that using the term "unsuccessful" or "abortive" in regard to the Anabaptists does not necessarily imply a negative value judgment in regard to the movement. It is much more important, it seems to me, to note that this type of movement must inevitably be "unsuccessful" in terms of numbers and support, if it is faithful to its original inspiration, because of its lack of accommodation to worldly canons of rationality and compromise.³⁰

Take Muentzer for example. The rational option would have been for him to accept Luther's personal authority as superior to his own, and to follow generally Luther's view of the Word and its relation to church and community, even though he suspected that Luther depended too much upon "word" and not enough upon "spirit," and that he encouraged easy living rather than the suffering way of the cross.³¹ Muentzer felt rather that he must sacrifice his life at once, if necessary, in order to wipe out the godless and bring in the Kingdom immediately, and his sincerity and lack of compromise on principle is no less evident than his chaotic Messianism and his unstable appeals to violence.³² Luther could be equally uncompromising. But as the leader of a growing movement, he knew very well the necessity of

compromise and adjustment for the good of the larger Christian "Gemeinschaft."⁸³

In the same way, Grebel's proposals to Zwingli were really unworkable if put into effect at one stroke, as he demanded. Enforcing holiness on the whole community was, to be sure, later achieved by Calvin to a remarkable extent in Geneva (as it was in later Anabaptist colonies, especially Hutterite), but he did not go about it by abolishing the relation of church and state and attempting to have all things in common immediately, as did Grebel.⁸⁴ The enthusiasm and lack of compromise manifest in Grebel made him unsuited as a colleague for Zwingli and, much more, made impossible his own projected leadership over the church and its relation to the whole city, so far as contemporary opinion regarded the matter.⁸⁵ Thus, the combination of absolute sincerity, uncompromising religious commitment, and lack of political adaptability resulted in bitter persecution for the sixteenth century Anabaptists.

While the counter-revolutionaries were being forced into becoming a defensive, outlawed movement, they had an accompanying stage, which might be described as a *second* indispensable characteristic of sixteenth century Anabaptism. This was a feeling of *extreme hopefulness* for the conversion of all Europe to their pattern of faith and life.

It was this characteristic of Anabaptist enthusiasm which made immediate action of some sort understandable on the part of the leading Reformers. Neither Luther, Zwingli, nor Calvin felt that they could allow the Anabaptist threat to develop without enforcement of active restraint against the counter-revolutionaries. In spite of its utopianism, the Anabaptist movement was not slow to develop a devoted following.⁸⁶ The "bark" of the Anabaptists was much harder than their "bite," but the Reformers, wary and suspicious, could not know that. Zuerich was the first city to act legally against Anabaptism and its proscriptions were the most severe.⁸⁷ Luther was more hesitant to allow the temporal arm to interfere in matters of faith, but toward the end of his life he too was willing that the death penalty be put into effect for "blasphemy" and "sedition."⁸⁸ The two most lenient areas toward Anabaptism were Strassburg, where banishment and frequent disputations replaced enforcement of the death penalty, and Hesse, where Philip of Hesse consistently allowed no executions for heresy within his lands.⁸⁹

A few quotations will give the flavor of this extreme Anabaptist hopefulness in the early stages of the movement, whether in the first outburst of enthusiasm, around 1524, or in the climactic renewal of hope, around 1534.

In his Prague manifesto of 1521, Thomas Muentzer proclaimed that:

The end of the world is at hand! God will reward His own people at the time of the final harvest. For this reason I have come to your land, my dear Bohemian brethren. Do not fail to study the living Word of God, when it proceeds out of God's own mouth . . . In a short time, the earthly Kingdom will be given to God's own elect, in the age of ages. Even in your land, the new apostolic church will rule over all.⁴⁰

When he preached to the Saxon princes in 1523, Muentzer noted that the "new reformation" would not come without violence:

The Spirit reveals to the elect a mighty and irresistible reformation to come. This is the fulfilment of the prediction of Daniel about the fifth monarchy . . . Think not that the power of God will be realized if your swords rust in the scabbard. The sword is given to you to wipe out the ungodly. If you decline, it will be taken from you. Spare not the idolators. Priests and monks who mock the Gospel should be killed. The godless have no right to live.⁴¹

In 1524 Zwingli reported that Conrad Grebel and the other Zuerich radicals had proposed:

A special group of people and kind of church was to be raised up, with Christian people inside, living holy lives, believing the Gospel and following it, having nothing to do with tithes and usury, having all things in common, and, in addition, a Christian civil council was to be established.⁴²

One notes here the characteristic Zuerich Anabaptist approach—more restrained and dependent upon Biblical literalism than Muentzer, but still quite utopian and enthusiastic. After they had been outlawed in Zuerich, Grebel and his associates closed their written appeal to Muentzer with the following indications of discipleship:

We have good hopes for (you), Jacob Strauss, and a few others who are little esteemed by the slothful scholars at Wittenberg . . . All men follow them because they follow a sinful sweet Christ, and they lack clear discernment such as you have set forth in your tracts, which have taught and strengthened us beyond measure, who are poor in spirit.

. . . On the matter of baptism, your book pleases us well, and we desire to be instructed further by you. Since you know this ten times better than we and have published your protests against infant baptism, we hope that you are not acting against the eternal Word of God, according to which only believers are to be baptized, and are not baptizing children.

. . . You are far purer than our men here and those of Wittenberg, who flounder from one perversion of Scripture into the next.

. . . Signed by Grebel, Castelberg, Manz, Aberli, Broedli, Oggenfusz, and Huiuf, your brethren, who regard themselves as seven new young Muentzers, against Luther.⁴³

And this in spite of their repudiation of Muentzer's violence.

In 1528 Hans Weischenfelder, a German Anabaptist, testified as follows:

Yes, he had been baptized by Hans Hut (a follower of Muentzer who later became a non-resistant Anabaptist), on Christmas a year ago. He said that, with his brethren, he believed that all those who had been converted, were baptized, and obeyed their Lord would judge the whole world, according to the signs in Matthew 24 and Luke 21, and then the end would come.⁴⁴

Melchior Hofmann, who though non-violent inspired the later Muenster uprising, proclaimed in 1533 that:

As Rome is the spiritual Babylon, so Strassburg is the spiritual Jerusalem. The inhabitants of this Jerusalem, quickened by the apostolic command, shall cover the entire earth, 144,000 strong, with the baptism of water and the covenant.⁴⁵

Here also is mention of the covenant, which Muentzer had derived from the Old Testament and was first to introduce as a means for revolutionary action in 1524.⁴⁶

Obbe Philips, who re-baptized Menno Simons, the founder of the Mennonites, himself told how he had been re-baptized by representatives of Jan Matthys, the "Enoch" of the violently revolutionary Muenster kingdom:

Two messengers came to us at Leeuwarden, namely Bartholomaeus Boekbinder and Willem de Cuiper . . . They told us the purpose of their mission. Jan Matthys had shown them the power of the Spirit, with signs and wonders beyond expression in words. They comforted us, saying that we should not be in anxiety or fear, because from that time forward Christians need no longer fear death. To the contrary, God would immediately destroy all tyranny and would wipe out the godless . . . We were all inexperienced, like children, and had not thought that we might be deceived by our own brethren, who every day were in the same danger of persecution and death as we. That day nearly all of us accepted baptism at their hands.⁴⁷

Menno Simons testified in his writings that his meditation on the errors of Muenster and other violent Anabaptist forays, resulting in the death of his own brother while a revolutionary in assault upon "Het Oude Klooster" near Bolsward in 1535⁴⁸, had aided Menno's conversion from Catholicism to peaceful Anabaptism, when he realized that he was not as dedicated as were his revolutionary brothers:

The sect of Muenster began making inroads, and many pious hearts in our province were led into error. My soul was troubled very much, for I perceived that, though they were zealous, they erred in doctrine . . . I conferred twice with one of their leaders, once in private, and again in public. But my warnings availed nothing, because I myself did that which I knew very well was not right . . . I saw that these zealous children willingly gave their lives and their estates for their doctrine and faith, though they were in error. But I wished only to live comfortably and without the cross of Christ.⁴⁹

Nevertheless, in spite of his unwavering non-resistance doctrine, Menno believed that in the last days the Anabaptists would crush their enemies under their feet:

Yes, beloved brethren, the longed-for day of your visitation is at hand, in which you shall stand with great power against those who have afflicted you and have exacted your sweat and toil, nay, your blood and life. Then shall all our persecutors be as ashes under the soles of our feet. They shall recognize too late that emperor, king, duke, prince, crown, sceptre, majesty, power, sword and mandate are but earth, dust, wind, and smoke.⁵⁰

Compare the faith of the Jehovah's Witnesses today.

Bernhard Rothmann, finally, restated the program of violent revolutionary Anabaptism in a tract written for the Muenster kingdom, to which he was a significant contributor:

The Scriptures reveal to us that the history of the world is divided into three periods. The first period reached from Adam until the time of Noah. The second kingdom reached from the time of Noah until the Restitution. But the immediate responsibility of the saints in the Third Kingdom, as in the time of Noah, is to wipe out all the godless. Only then shall righteousness be spread throughout the whole earth, and the rule of Christ, within the temple of David, on earth, shall be wonderfully completed.⁵¹

By 1534 Rothmann had come around again, full circle, to Thomas Muentzer's violently revolutionary teaching of the 1520s. But Rothmann and the Muenster fanatics were crushed with even more ignominy than had been accorded to Muentzer as an abortive leader of incipient Anabaptism and the Peasants' War.⁵² The bones of Knipperdollinck and Jan of Leiden were hung in cages from the tower of St. Lambert's church in Muenster for three hundred years thereafter. Rothmann's body was never found.

An additional observation is necessary to clarify the relationship between what I have called the two indispensable characteristics of Anabaptism, defensiveness and hopefulness. It is not quite accurate to say that the movement was first very hopeful with many accompanying vagaries of chiliasm, revolution, quietism, prophetism, polygamy, and crusades, and then later became depressed and defensive, conservative and isolated into segregated conventicles.⁵³ Rather, there appear to me to have been at least two cycles of hopeful Anabaptist counter-revolution in the second and third decades of the sixteenth century. In the second cycle, especially, the defensiveness was not chronologically subsequent to the hopefulness, but hopefulness was in combination with defensiveness, and, indeed, issued out of defensiveness. Thus, Anabaptism implicates itself with violent revolution on two different counts. Not only was it originally violent in part of its revolutionary program, in connection with Muentzer, a frequent occurrence in movements which later become staid and sober, but it also resulted in a subsequent occasion of violent revolution, at Muenster. The violently revolutionary programs of Muentzer and the Muensterites were quite alike, and though Muentzer did not have opportunity for re-baptism, every inhabitant of the important city of Muenster was re-baptized.⁵⁴ To be quite fair, the severe persecution and elimination of sober Anabaptist leadership may well have contributed to the second outburst at Muenster.⁵⁵ But the inescapable conclusion must be that Anabaptist counter-revolution exhibited violent tendencies both in its beginnings, and on at least one later occasion.⁵⁶ Thus, the traditional

Lutheran and Reformed criticism of Anabaptism has considerable validity, in spite of American Anabaptist efforts at revision.

After having said this much in criticism of an aspect of current American Anabaptist historiography, I should like to conclude on the note that the non-resistant side of Anabaptism also has a fairly clear and consistent record, and that a comparatively non-fanatical aspect of Anabaptism can be traced all the way from Grebel and many of his Swiss associates in 1525 through the continuing peaceful Anabaptist groups of Hutterites and Mennonites. I am saying that Anabaptism as abortive counter-revolution, in spite of its violent aspects, was still, for most of its pious adherents, a movement advocating peace and the suffering way of the cross rather than violence.⁶⁷ Here the Mennonites are correct in their interpretations, representing settled conservatism rather than the radical upheaval of the early days.

One may observe in this connection an important recurring paradox within the history of Christian faith. Groups beginning amid the defensiveness and extravagant hopefulness of revolt, like the early Christians or the early Anabaptists, often reflect the purest light of the Christian Gospel in spite of themselves, whether their activity be non-resistant or violent. A relevant word by D. M. Mackinnon might be quoted in conclusion, in reference to the current problem of the validity of revolt amid the confrontation between Christian and Communist faiths:

The man who revolts, determined somehow to affirm in this most desperate situation that God did not so make the world, is met by the mystery of God's own revolt against the world He made, in the holiness of the crucified. Past, present, and future alike are the occasion of God's revolt, in silent weakness, breaking the pretensions of men, even as He lays them bare. For if God must protest, must in flesh and blood lay bare the issues of human life for what they are, then protest and revolt belong to being as such.⁶⁸

1. The latest article in this series from an American Mennonite viewpoint, by Harold S. Bender, maintains that "neither Thomas Muentzer nor the Zwickian prophets were Anabaptists, and that neither had anything to do with the later Anabaptist movement." In *Theologische Zeitschrift* (Jul.-Aug. 1952), 262 ff. and *Mennonite Quarterly Review* (Jan. 1953), 2 ff, he does admit that "some who were under the spell of Muentzer later became Anabaptists, e.g., Hans Hut and Melchior Rink" (*MQR*, 16), which contradicts his claim that Muentzer had "nothing to do with the later Anabaptist movement." Note the very careful review on Anabaptist historiography by Franklin H. Littell in *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (American Society of

Church History, 1952). Littell follows the Mennonite interpretation generally, though he gives full consideration to violent aspects in the early stages of "Left-Wing Reformation." Roland H. Bainton suggested the term "Left-Wing Reformation" for application to all of the groups, including Anabaptists in the Mennonite usage, to the "left" of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin in the Reformation in *Journal of Religion* (July 1941), 124 ff.

2. Karl Holl, in "Luther und die Schwärmer" in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, (Tübingen, 1923), I, 420 ff., presented the Lutheran view of Muentzer and his associates as enthusiasts or fanatics, though he was not without sympathy for Muentzer. Heinrich Boehmer, in a

similar tradition, called Muentzer "der Urheber der grossen Taufbewegung" in "Thomas Muentzer und das Juengste Deutschland" (in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Gotha, 1927, 221). Generally speaking, if one chooses Zuerich (with Troeltsch) as the place of origin for Anabaptism, the movement will be regarded from the prevailing American Mennonite standpoint as non-fanatical. If one chooses Wittenberg or Zwickau (with Holl), the movement will be regarded as fanatical, from the Lutheran standpoint. I would support a middle position, similar to that of Walther Koehler, who maintained that "Zuerich was the scene of the first Anabaptist congregation and performed the first adult baptism, but the idea of re-baptism and the separation of the brotherhood of believers from the peoples' church appeared first in the circles of the Wittenberg fanatics, with whom the Zuerich brotherhood maintained contacts without having been called into existence by them." (In *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, second edition, 1931), V, 1915. "Contacts" is perhaps too strong, though one of the Zuerich party had been with Muentzer, and there is certainly a great similarity between the two movements.

3. Hans von Schubert's terminology. Suggestive Mennonite interpretations of basic Anabaptists views include Harold S. Bender, "The Anabaptist Vision" ("discipleship"), in *Church History* (Mar. 1944), 3 ff. and Robert Friedmann, "Conception of the Anabaptists" (Scriptural norms centered in the Sermon on the Mount), in *Church History* (Dec. 1940), 341 ff. These articles take as standard for Anabaptism the continuing conservative Mennonite and Hutterite doctrines. All other views within the developing movement are ignored. The *Mennonite Quarterly Review* has published scores of extremely valuable historical articles, within these limitations. See the index of MQR articles from 1927 to 1951 in MQR (Jan. 1952, 65 ff.).

From a non-Mennonite standpoint, Wilhelm Pauck, for example, has noted the significance of the "simplifying tendency" of Anabaptism for the future of Protestantism: "thus the Protestant spirit is a spirit of prophetic criticism." *The Heritage of the Reformation* (Boston, 1950), 141.

4. Lowell H. Zuck, "Anabaptist Revolution Through the Covenant in Sixteenth Century Continental Protestantism" (unpublished dissertation, Yale University, 1955).
5. Aleander stated that Luther was a revolutionary who had urged that the Germans should wash their hands in the blood of the papists. *Deutsche Reichstagsakten* (Gotha, 1896), II, 496 ff. Luther's statement referred to was in

reply to Prierias. *Wiemar Ausgabe*, 6, 585.

6. W. A., 2, 278: "quod est Ihesus Christus, et auctoritate Petri 1.2 ubi Christum lapidem vivum et angularem appellat, docens, ut superedificemur in donum spirituale. Alioquin si Petrus esset fundamentum ecclesie, lapsa fuisset ecclesia . . ."
7. Luther: "Denn, das ich oben ansahe, Was verzweivelter boesen Secten und Ketzerey haben sich erfuergethan, als Muentzer, Zwingeler, Widerteuffer und viel mehr." W. A., 51, 587. "So solt ihr wissen, das des Muentzers geist auch noch lebt. . ." W. A., 30, II, 276.
8. Toward the end of December 1524, Zwingli wrote "Wer Ursach gebe zu Aufruhr" [in *Huldreich Zwinglis Saemtliche Werke*,—*Corpus Reformatorum* 91, ed. Emil Egli, et al. (Berlin, 1905 ff.), II, 355 ff.], and Grebel wrote a protest to the city council denying that he was seditious. See Harold S. Bender, Conrad Grebel, the First Leader of the Swiss Brethren (Goshen, Ind., 1950), 130. At the same time, Grebel wrote to his brother-in-law, Vadian: "Zwingli is writing about sedition; it will probably hit us. You will see that something will come of it." (Translated in "Nine Letters of Conrad Grebel" by Edward Yoder, MQR, 1928, 229 ff.).
9. Menno, for example, said, "I was never in the company of the rebellious . . . It is France, Italy, Spain, and Burgundy, but also all the German nations who boast of the Word, who are guilty of fighting, warring, robbing, and shedding blood." Menno Simons, *Complete Works* (Elkhart, Ind., 1871), II, 62, 63. Compare the quotation referred to in note 49.
10. The term "revolutionary" includes not only outward manifestations of violence, but also that which contemporaries regard with horror as so unusual that it threatens the continued stability of orderly life. Note Crane Brinton, *The Anatomy of Revolution* (New York, 1952), for a typology of revolutions, political in this case.
11. There were unsuccessful counter-revolutionaries who were not Anabaptists. Hutten and Sickingen might be so regarded, though they appear rather to have been on the side of the leaders of Reform. Their motives were primarily political and nationalist, not religious. See Roland H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York, 1950, Mentor edition), 100. The Peasants' War may be regarded as unsuccessful counter-revolution, though its antecedents went back well beyond the outbreak of the Reformation. See Albert Rosenkranz, *Der Bundschuh, die Erhebungen des Südwestdeutschen Bauernstandes 1493-1517* (Heidelberg, 1927). The Peasants' War was generally not much in-

- fluenced by Anabaptism, though Muentzer attempted to lead. Its motivation was not primarily religious. See Guenther Franz, *Der deutsche Bauernkrieg* (Muenchen, 1943).
12. Luther, in typical fashion for his time, regarded as seditious any avoidance of public office or military service, which was the political platform of the peaceful Anabaptists. W. A., 31, I, 207 f. Compare similar interpretations held in some American (and foreign) sectors of thought in the twentieth century.
 13. An example is the recent article, "Anabaptists," by Harold S. Bender in *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1955), I, 35 ff.
 14. For recent literature on the Muenster kingdom, consult "Das Reich der Wiedertaeufer zu Muenster 1534-5," by Fritze Blanke, in *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte* (Leipzig 1940), 13 ff. A recent useful collection of source materials may be found in Klemens Loeffler, *Die Wiedertaeufer zu Muenster 1534-5* (Jena, 1923). The typical Anabaptist terminology for rebaptism ("covenant of a good conscience with God") is found on page 102.
 15. The Anabaptists were not nearly as much concerned about the actual performance or form of baptism (the controversy about immersion did not occur in this period), as were later Baptists. The name was thrust upon them by their opponents, giving legal grounds for repressing "re-baptism." The Anabaptist preference for the term "Brethren" indicates that their covenantal relationship in opposition to the main Reformers was more important to them than external concerns with doctrines or rites, including baptism. Compare Menno's words, "We are not regenerated because we have been baptized. We are baptized because we have been regenerated by faith and the Word of God," (*Complete Works*, 1871, I, 35), with Luther's on the other side, "Gerade als were die tauffe ein vergenglich menschen werk gewesen, gleich wie die widerteuffer leren, und nicht ein ewiger bund." (W. A., 30, II, 308).
 16. Alfred Hegler and Ernst Troeltsch insisted upon a strict separation between the Biblical literalist, disciplined "Taeufer" and the more individualist "Spiritualisten." [*Geist und Schrift bei Sebastian Franck* (Freiburg, 1892) and *Social Teachings of the Christian Churches* (New York, 1931)]. Johannes Kuehn distinguished further between "mystics" and "spiritualists" in *Toleranz und Offenbarung* (Leipzig, 1923), 140, 271. Roland H. Bainton finds "mystical," "spiritual," "eschatological," and "revolutionary" motifs in the left-wing Reformers in *David Joris: Wiedertaeufer und Kaempfer fuer Toleranz im 16. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1937), 8 ff.
 17. I refer to marginal "spiritual Anabaptists" like Hans Denck (who was rebaptized by Balthasar Huebmaier, a non-pacifist Anabaptist), Ludwig Hetzer, and, to a lesser extent, Johannes Buenderlin, Casper Schwenckfeld, Sebastian Franck, and others. Franck's pattern of rejection of other church doctrines indicates the point, though he could hardly be called an "Anabaptist" by any standard, including my own: "In our times, there are already three faiths which have a large following, the Lutheran, Zwinglian, and Anabaptist. But a fourth is already on the way to birth, which dispenses with external preaching, ceremonies, sacraments, the ban, and offices as unnecessary, and which seeks to gather only an invisible, spiritual church in the unity of the Spirit and of faith, governed wholly by the eternal, invisible Word of God." [*Chronica und Beschreibung der Tuerkey* (Nuernberg, 1530), K.3b, quoted by Rufus M. Jones, *Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries* (London, 1914), 49, a sympathetic interpreter of these people.] It is interesting to try to squeeze Erasmus into this category, though precision in terminology is exceptionally difficult within the ineffable province of mysticism and inner, individual faith.
 18. Ernst Troeltsch and Wilhelm Dilthey have pointed out (perhaps modernizing too much) that these men have been vindicated by the growth of "spiritual" faith within nineteenth and twentieth century Protestant religious life. In spite of present-day reaction against the theological implications of their positions, Troeltsch and Dilthey have stressed a most significant point historically. Note Dilthey's *Auffassung und Analyse des Menschen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert, in Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Berlin, 1924), II, 109.
 19. The relative membership of varying religious traditions in America would seem to prove this point, e.g., Baptists are most numerous among Protestants, within a free situation, though they are not Anabaptists according to a sixteenth century standard.
- Also, elaborate theological justifications for each of the contending Reformation parties have tended to obscure for their adherents some of the underlying personal, social, and political factors which contributed to the splintering of Protestantism. The man on the street is sometimes more aware than are the theologians of additional motives besides the theological which sometimes exacerbate theological disagreements. Imperialism, unfortunately, is still as much at home on the ecclesiastical as on the political scene.
20. For example, the edict of the Diet of

Worms, in condemning Luther, stated that Luther had destroyed obedience to authority and had published writings which served only to foment revolt, schism, and bloody dissensions. Text in *Deutsche Reichstagsakten* (Gotha, 1896), II, 640 ff. Jacques Maritain wrote that "Protestantism, that wild revolutionary work . . . promises rest to the reason only in contradiction. It sets a universal war within us. It has inflamed everything, and healed nothing." In *Three Reformers: Luther, Descartes-Rousseau* (New York, 1929), 50. A Protestant would not agree, suggesting the ecumenical movement as evidence to the contrary.

21. Religious toleration was emphatically not characteristic of the Reformation as Roland Bainton, among others, has pointed out. See "The Struggle for Religious Liberty," in *Church History* (June 1941, 3 ff.) Amid the almost universal religious intolerance of the sixteenth century, it appears to me that the Anabaptists were among the most intolerant toward views not their own and were not necessarily unwilling to use constraint, as this paper indicates. Harold S. Bender, however, argues to the contrary in "The Anabaptists and Religious Liberty in the Sixteenth Century" in *Archiv fuer Reformationsgeschichte* (1953), 32 ff. Religious tolerance is best proved when evidenced by parties in a position to persecute, rather than among those undergoing persecution for their faith. Both Catholic and Protestant church history indicates that religious tolerance is usually the cry of the weaker parties, the reluctant solution for a deadlock, or a result of a latitudinarian or doubtful faith. One may express the hope that religious tolerance in America today has a deeper basis than the motives suggested here.
22. Calvin and the Catholic Inquisition could collaborate, for instance, in an effort to suppress an Anabaptist-Anti-Trinitarian heretic, Michael Servetus, but otherwise they fought bitterly against each other. Note Roland H. Bainton, *Hunted Heretic, the Life and Death of Michael Servetus 1511-1553* (Boston, 1953), 156, 157.
23. See note 1 above.
24. Muentzer was German, Grebel was Swiss. Muentzer had been trained as a Catholic priest, and, agonizingly religious, sought to overcome his doubts whether God really exists (compare Luther's less radical question whether God could be gracious to a sinner). Grebel, on the other hand, educated as a humanist, enjoyed reading Plato and writing epigrams in imitation of the Greek sophist, Lucian, before he became Zwingli's convert. Muentzer was a born preacher and demagogue. Grebel

preferred to write rather than to speak in his own defense.

Otto H. Brandt presented Muentzer's life and writings, in modernized German, in *Thomas Muentzer, Sein Leben und Seine Schriften* (Jena, 1933). Heinrich Boehmer's work on Muentzer was described in note 2 above. *Thomas Muentzer's Briefwechsel*, ed. Heinrich Boehmer and Paul Kirn (Leipzig, 1931), is useful, together with Annemarie Lohmann's *Zur Geistigen Entwicklung Thomas Muentzers* (Leipzig, 1931), Carl Hinrich's *Luther und Muentzer, Ihre Auseinandersetzung Ueber Obrigkeit und Widerstandsrecht* (Berlin, 1952), and a dissertation by Hayo Gerdes, *Luthers Streit mit den Schwärmern um das rechte Verstaendnis des Gesetzes Mose* (Goettingen, 1955), 76 ff. A Socialist account of Muentzer is by L. G. Walter, *Thomas Munzer et les luttes sociales a l'époque de la réforme* (Paris, 1927), and a recent Russian Communist view of Muentzer as a proto-Marxist is by M. M. Smirin, *Die Volksreformation des Thomas Muenzer und der grosse Bauernkrieg* (Berlin, 1952), tr. from the edition published in Moscow in 1947.

25. Grebel's manner of address to Muentzer indicated that he felt Muentzer was not swift enough in implementing his radical proposals: "We admonish and beseech you . . . the more willingly, because you have so kindly listened to our brother and confessed that you too have given way too much [!], and because you and Carlstadt are esteemed by us the purest proclaimers of the purest words of God . . . Go forward with the Word and establish a Christian church, with the help of Christ and His rule . . . If you or Carlstadt will not write sufficiently against infant baptism, with all that implies, I (Cunrat Grebel) will try my hand. . . ." The exclamation point is mine. This was written before the first re-baptisms had begun in Zuerich.
26. Except the Marxists (see note 24 above). Muentzer is related to New England Puritanism insofar as he introduced the necessity for inward conversion experiences in order to qualify for church membership as one of the elect, characteristic of the troubled piety of early Puritans in New England. Noted in Bainton's *Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Boston, 1953), 66, 115. Muentzer was also the first to use the covenant idea in the Reformation (1524), again indicating his relationship to later Calvinist ideas. Compare note 46.
27. The title of Bender's very thorough Grebel biography. An article on Grebel with source materials in German, by Christian Neff, appeared in the *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Jaehrigen Ju-*

- bilacum der Mennoniten oder Taufgesinnten 1525-1925* (Ludwigshafen, 1925), 65 ff.
28. Grebel's words to Muentzer: "We too are rejected by our learned shepherds . . . who preach a sinful sweet Christ." (In *Muentzers Briefwechsel*, 96).
 29. Indicated by the important letter of Grebel and his Swiss associates to Muentzer, Sept. 5, 1524. *Muentzers Briefwechsel*, 92. A fine translation and commentary by Walter Rauschenbusch appeared in the *American Journal of Theology* (Jan. 1905, 91 ff.).
 30. The Anabaptists certainly exemplified all of the characteristics, positive and negative, which H. Richard Niebuhr attributes to the "Christ against culture" type of Christian organization. *Christ and Culture* (New York, 1950), 45 ff.
 31. Examples of Muentzer's virulent abuse of Luther: "Es duenkt die Welt und die unversuchten Schriftgelehrten das allerunmoeglichste Ding zu sein, dass die Niedrigen sollen erhoben und abgeseondert von den Boesen werden . . . Es muss ein jeder die Kunst Gottes, den rechten Christenglauben, nit durch stinkenden Atem teuflicher Schriftgelehrten bekommen, sondern durch ewige kraefftige Wort des Vaters im Sohn mit Erlaeuterung des heiligen Geists und also erfuellet werden in seiner Seel . . . Und Gott sagt zum gottlosen Prediger: 'Wer hat dich geheissen meine Gerechtigkeit predigen? Und du nimmst meinen bezeugten Bund in deinen Mund und hast die Zucht gehasset.' Wie sollen er sagen: Willst du meinen lieben gekreuzigten Sohn der Welt um deines Bauches willen predigen und weisest nit, wie man ihm muss gleichfoermig werden, Röm. 8? . . . Also muss der rechte Glaub den Sieg gewinnen, I Johannes 5, nachdem er die Welt ueberwindet. . . ." In Brandt, 173, 177, 181, 179.
 32. Compare some similar attitudes and statements of a successful present-day statesman, John Foster Dulles. Paul Tillich suggests that the views of Muentzer have had more influence upon American churches and politics than those of Luther, who was more medieval and European. Tillich notes especially courage and violent activity as American derivatives from the spirit of Muentzer. See Tillich's *The Courage to Be* (New Haven, Conn., 1952), 171.
 33. Luther's words in quieting the Wittenberg disturbances are typical: "Do not suppose that abuses are eliminated by destroying the object which is abused. Men can go wrong with wine and women. Shall we then prohibit wine and abolish women? . . . Such haste and violence betray a lack of confidence in God . . . Had I wished I might have started a revolution at Worms. But while I quietly waited and drank beer with Philip and Amsdorf, God dealt the papacy a mighty blow." W. A., 10, III, 24 f., 18 f.
 34. Observe Zwingli's account of Grebel's proposals referred to in note 42 below. It is interesting that Grebel's only popular success was among the peasants in Grueningen, where the peasants had just plundered a monastery, and in Toess, where a popular peasants' assembly was attempting revolt near the time when Grebel visited there. See Bender's *Grebel*, which denies any connection, 148, 154.
 35. In his letter to Muentzer, Grebel admitted that "with us there are not twenty who believe the Word of God. (Others) trust the persons, Zwingli, Leo (Juda), and others, who are esteemed learned elsewhere also. If you must suffer, you know well that it cannot be otherwise." (*Muentzers Briefwechsel*, 100).
 36. In spite of the scattered origins and places of spread of Anabaptism (Thuringia, Saxony, Switzerland, South Germany, Moravia, Strassburg, the Netherlands, Westphalia, and elsewhere), there was a strong consciousness of "party line" across provincial and national boundaries. Notice how Obbe Philips, from a Dutch Anabaptist standpoint, discussed together Thomas Muentzer, Melchior Hofmann, Jan of Leiden, David Joris, Menno Simons, and himself (though he insisted that he and Menno were non-resistant), in a way the present-day American Mennonites would consider highly improper. Obbe Philips, "Bekentenisse" (1584), in *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, ed. S. Cramer and F. Pijper (s 'Gravenhage, 1910), VII, 114, 118, 119.
 37. The two mandates of the Zuerich city council, early in 1525, decreed banishment from the canton with wife, children, and goods, for refusal to have a child baptized. (In Leonhard von Muralt, ed., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer in der Schweiz* (Zuerich, 1952, 35, f.). In November, Grebel, Manz, and Blaurock were sentenced to life imprisonment. (von Muralt, 136). By March 1526, drowning was set as the penalty for re-baptism, and Manz was executed by drowning on Jan. 25, 1527, for having rebaptized. (von Muralt, 181, 226).
 38. ". . . Wo jemand leren wolt, das Christus nicht Gott sey, sondern ein schlechter mensch und gleich wie ein ander prophet, wie die Tuereken und die Widderteuffer halten, die sol man auch nicht leiden, sondern als die offentlichen lesterer straffen. Denn sie sind auch nicht schlecht allein ketzer, sondern offentliche lesterer." (1530), W. A., 31, I, 208.
 39. Camill Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Seetenbewegung 1524-1534*

- (Strassburg, 1889). Robert Kreider notes the treatment of the Anabaptists by the Strassburg Reformers in "The Anabaptists and Civil Authorities of Strasbourg 1525-55," in *Church History* (June 1955, 99 ff.).
- For Hesse, consult the abundance of sources in Walter Koehler et al., ed., *Urkundliche Quellen zur hessischen Reformationsgeschichte, Wiedertaufer-akten 1527-1626* (Marburg, 1951).
40. Muentzers *Briefwechsel*, 150. ("Praeger Anschlag," 1521).
 41. Brandt, 162, 163. ("Die Fuerstenpredigt," 1524).
 42. Emil Egli, ed., *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zuercher Reformation in den Jahren 1519-33* (Zuerich, 1879), I, 72.
 43. Muentzers *Briefwechsel*, 92 ff.
 44. Paul Wappler, ed., *Die Tauerbewegung in Thueringen von 1526-1584* (Jena, 1913), 279, 281. (Parentheses are mine, with information therein). References to the influence of Hut and Muentzer are plentiful throughout the Thuringian processes, e.g., 243, 432, 462.
 45. Testimony of Melchior Hofmann, April 15, 1535, in *Zeitschrift fuer die historische Theologie* (Gotha, 1860), 98.
 46. Gottlob Schrenck argued that "Zwingli was the real renewer of covenant thought for Reformed theology, but the suggestion for it came from his Anabaptist opponents." In *Gottesreich und Bund in Aelteren Protestantismus* (Gütersloh, 1923), 36. This cannot be proved. Zwingli used a covenant argument to support the continuing validity of infant baptism (parallel to circumcision) in his 1525 work against Anabaptism, "Von der Touff, Widertouff, und Kindertouff," in *Zwinglis Werke* 91, IV, 188 ff., partly translated in G. W. Bromiley, *Zwingli and Bullinger* ("The Library of Christian Classics") (Philadelphia, 1953), 24 ff.
 - Thomas Muentzer, however, declared in July 1524 that the covenant was his basis for violent revolution (*Muentzer Briefwechsel*, 74 ff.), and the princes became alarmed when they realized the implications of his covenant organization. My dissertation discusses Muentzer and Anabaptist covenant thought at length.
 47. *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, VII, 129 tr. in John Horsek, *Mennonites in Europe* (Scottsdale, Pa., 1942), 177. Obbe Philips vividly portrayed the errors of violent Anabaptism.
 48. B. R. N., VII, 461. Cornelius Krahn's biography, *Menno Simons 1496-1561* (Karlsruhe, 1936), 28 ff., judiciously examines violent aspects within Dutch Anabaptist origins. Henry E. Dosker treated the same subject in *The Dutch Anabaptists* (Philadelphia, 1921), 84 ff.
 49. Menno Simons, "Renunciation", *Complete Works*, I, 4. Compare the Dutch edition, *Opera Omnia Theologica* (Amsterdam, 1681), 257. At about the same time, hundreds of Netherlanders were swarming to the Muenster kingdom. They came from a score of districts, but especially were influenced from Amsterdam and Leiden. See a recent review of the evidence in a Dutch dissertation, A. F. Mellink, *De Wederdopers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden 1531-1544* (Groningen, 1953), 102 ff. The Bolsward assault, the attempt to burn Leiden, the siege of Amsterdam, and the riot at 't Zand were by no means the only instances of violence within early Dutch Anabaptism.
 50. *Complete Works*, I, 205. "The Cross of Christ."
 51. Bernhard Rothmann, "Von Verborgtheit der Schrift des Riques Christi vnd Von dem Dage des Herrn," in E. W. H. Hochhuth, *Bernhard Rothmanns Schriften* (Gotha, 1857), 47, 50.
 52. The grisly details are in Loeffler, 234 ff.
 53. Compare Roland Bainton's latest treatment of Anabaptism, a careful statement which sees in the early stages of the movement a multitude of minutely varied little groups behind different leaders, all hopeful for complete vindication but unwilling to co-operate with their slightly different colleagues. *The Age of the Reformation* (Princeton, N. J., 1956, paper), 41 ff. Though separatism was most characteristic of these people, a survey of what they held in common is not without value.
 54. See note 14. I have been unable to find the source for the statement that 1400 Muenster citizens had already been re-baptized in January 1534, before the arrival of Jan of Leiden and the subsequent rage for re-baptism had been completed, mentioned both in Loeffler, 5, and Koehler, *Realenzyklopaedia fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, third edition, ed. A. Hauck, 13, 547.
 55. A remarkable aspect of early Anabaptism is thus not so much its occasional violence, as its frequent exhibition of sobriety and good sense amidst emotional upheaval and martyrdom.
 56. See note 49.
 57. Compare Ethelbert Stauffer, "Maertryertheologie und Tauerbewegung," in *Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte* (1933), 545 ff.
 58. *Christian Faith and Communist Faith*, ed. D. M. Mackinnon (London, 1953), 247. Albert Camus, from a different perspective, notes the validity of revolt, although it is always threatened by either sterility or spiritual pride. Revolution takes the passionate side of

man into consideration, he says: "Revolution, though apparently negative since it creates nothing, is profoundly positive in that it reveals the part of man which must always be defended. . . . And so the real drama of revolutionary thought is revealed. In order to exist, *man must rebel*, but rebellion must respect the limits that it discovers within itself—limits where minds meet,

and in meeting, begin to exist . . . In contemplating the results of an act of revolution, we shall have to say, each time, whether it remains faithful to its first noble purpose or whether, through lassitude or folly, it forgets its purpose and plunges into a mire of tyranny or servitude." *The Rebel (L'homme revolte)* (New York, 1954), 25, 27, 28.

THE CONDEMNATION OF THE *SILLON*:
AN EPISODE IN THE HISTORY OF
CHRISTIAN-DEMOCRACY IN FRANCE

CHARLES BREUNIG, *Lawrence College*

Any study of France's political history since the Liberation must inevitably attempt to explain the sudden emergence in 1944 of that somewhat unconventional and ambiguous political grouping known as the *Mouvement Républicain Populaire*. Almost overnight the new party, despite its obscure origins and unfamiliar program, succeeded in winning the largest bloc of seats in the National Assembly and in the years since the war has provided France with some of her most prominent leaders. Although the M. R. P. has declined in parliamentary strength in recent years, it seems probable that the party of Robert Schuman and Georges Bidault will continue to play an important role in French politics.

The striking success of the Popular Republicans with the French electorate just after World War II caused no little amazement at the time and became a problem for the political analysts to ponder. For a party which was termed by its founders a "democratic movement of Christian inspiration" and whose leaders made no attempt to conceal their Catholicism was still something of an anomaly in a country where anticlericalism had for so long been a staple of political life.

Many reasons have been offered for the initial triumphs of the M. R. P. after the war. Not the least important of them was the reputation that certain Catholic leaders had earned for the part they played in the Resistance. Nor may one discount the appeal to the French electorate of an entirely new party whose program was based on a coherent set of moral and ethical values. But perhaps the most significant explanation lay in the political situation inherited from the Vichy regime. For the discrediting of the older conservative parties that resulted from their support of the Pétain government in 1940 created after the war a vacuum on the Right and Center which the M. R. P. temporarily succeeded in filling.

In any event, the problem of the M. R. P.'s success has already been examined in some detail by historians of the Fourth Republic.¹ Much less attention has been devoted however to earlier manifestations of Christian-Democratic action in France, though it is true that party spokesmen for the M. R. P. have provided the public with popularly written accounts of the movement's alleged ancestry.² In some cases the search of the Popular Republicans for the pioneers of Christian-Democratic action has carried them back to the nineteenth century

Catholic leaders Lamennais, Lacordaire, and Montalembert. In the more immediate past they find a link with the tiny Catholic political groupings that existed between the two wars, the *Parti démocrate populaire* and the *Parti de la jeune république*, both of which provided leaders for the M. R. P.

In between these two epochs, that is in the two decades preceding World War I, there flourished still another association which has been characterized by the M. R. P. as the "first mass movement" in the French Christian-Democratic tradition.³ This was the group known as *Le Sillon* ("The Furrow") founded and led by Marc Sangnier who, because of his pioneer work in the field, was in 1944 named Honorary President of the M. R. P., a post which he held until his death in 1950.⁴

Never a conventional political party, the *Sillon* passed through at least three separate phases during the course of its sixteen year history. From its inception in 1894 to about 1902, the movement was little more than a loose association of young Catholics of bourgeois origins who hoped to restore the waning influence of the Church in France by means of a popular apostolate among the working classes. Their activity did not differ greatly from that of the earlier "Social Catholic" movements organized during the last decades of the nineteenth century; indeed, they simply assumed control in many cases of the workers' "clubs" or "study-groups" (*cercles d'études*) that had formed a part of the Catholic popular education movement of the 1890's.⁵

From 1902 to 1905, years that witnessed the culmination of the struggle between the Church and the Third Republic, the *Sillon* experienced a period of very rapid growth which left it at the latter date with a membership estimated at twenty to twenty-five thousand scattered throughout the country.⁶ During these years the leaders of the movement took an increasing interest in political questions and formulated their program for the achievement of a "true democratic republic" inspired by Christian principles. Such a society, it was argued, would replace the existing regime in France, which they attacked as a "mere caricature" of a republic. Although the *Sillon* maintained and even expanded its popular education program in this period, it was through a series of dramatic public meetings protesting the anticlerical policy of the Combes government that public attention and new adherents were attracted to the movement.

The final years of the *Sillon's* history, from 1905 to 1910, witnessed an intensification of the trend towards political action, though it was still felt that a popular moral or spiritual regeneration must precede any thoroughgoing political change. Two particular moves characterized the later years of the movement. First, in order to

propagandize the cause, it was decided that Marc Sangnier should enter the electoral lists as a candidate for the Chamber of Deputies.⁷ Secondly, the *Sillon* directed an appeal for support to non-Catholics who shared the same "moral ideal" to join them in what they termed a "greater *Sillon*" (*plus grand Sillon*) for the realization of certain limited social and political objectives.

One consequence of the transformation of the *Sillon* after 1905 was a gradual deterioration of its relationship with members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in France who began openly to disapprove of the movement. Such antagonism was augmented by attacks upon the group from the royalist *Action Française* and from certain theologians and priests who pretended to find errors in *Silloniste* doctrine and to suggest that the movement was tainted with "modernism," the heresy which Pope Pius X condemned in the encyclical *Pascendi* in 1907. The growing opposition of the Church to the *Sillon* reached a dramatic climax with the "condemnation" of the movement in a papal encyclical of August, 1910, a document which ordered the leaders of the group to cede their places to the episcopacy and broke the movement into separate units which were to operate under the close supervision of the clergy.⁸ The net result of the papal letter was to end effectively the activity of the *Sillon* as it had existed up to that time.

* * * * *

It is in a sense ironical that the primary interest of the *Sillon* for the historian lies in the fact of its condemnation. Nevertheless, this would seem to be the case, for the suppression of the movement raises the question of the Vatican's motives, real or avowed, for disciplining a group of young Catholic democrats at this particular time and provides an illustration of some of the problems involved in Catholic political action. That the conclusions to be drawn from the experience of the *Sillon* are not necessarily valid outside the particular context in which it occurred is obvious, but they may at least throw some light on the risks facing a group that poses as a "democratic movement of Christian inspiration." It is also clear that the carefully prepared eight-thousand word document condemning the *Sillon*, like most papal statements of this nature, contained implications that transcended the immediate case with which it dealt and has served as a guide and a warning for subsequent Christian-Democratic groups.

The charges brought against the *Sillon* by the papacy may be classified into two broad categories: disciplinary and doctrinal, though the two were in many instances related. The first significant disciplinary error ascribed to the movement was its claim that it was not subject to ecclesiastical authority because its action lay in the temporal rather than the spiritual sphere. Such a claim was unjustified, as-

sented the encyclical, since the leaders of the *Sillon*, by their own admission, were "confirmed idealists" who "pretend to raise up the working classes by first exalting the human conscience" and who had a social doctrine and religious and philosophical principles for reconstructing society on a new plan. The argument concluded,

They are, therefore, really professors of social, civic and religious morality; and whatever modifications they may introduce in the organization of the *Silloniste* movement, we have the right to say that the object of the *Sillon*, its character and its action, belong to the moral domain, which is the proper domain of the Church, and that in consequence the *Sillonistes* deceive themselves when they believe that they are working upon a ground on the limits of which expire the rights of the doctrinal and directive power of ecclesiastical authority.⁹

The papacy was reiterating here a charge that was frequently brought against the *Sillon* before and after its suppression, namely that the movement was guilty of a certain "politico-religious confusion" in its goals which made difficult its classification either as an exclusively political group working for the attainment of a better form of democracy in France or as an evangelical association of Catholic laymen who were striving to win their fellow-countrymen back to the faith through the appeal of a program of democratic and social reforms.¹⁰ To what extent this charge was justified will appear subsequently.

From this accusation, the papacy could proceed to the related charge that the *Sillon* had subordinated religion to politics by implying that Catholicism favored a democratic form of government as that most compatible with the Church's interests. Furthermore, the *Sillonistes*, in their enthusiasm for democracy, had, according to the papacy, attempted to tie their religion to the interests of a given political party. Concerning this practice, the encyclical reasserted the traditional Catholic precept,

We have hardly to point out that the advent of universal democracy is not the concern of the Church's action in this world. We have already recalled that the Church has always left to the nations the choice of the government they esteem most advantageous for their interests. What we must affirm once again, like our predecessor, is that it is erroneous and dangerous to tie down Catholicism, by principle, to one form of government. . . .¹¹

The second major disciplinary error with which the *Sillon* was charged concerned its efforts to form a "greater *Sillon*" which would enlist the co-operation of non-Catholic as well as Catholic groups. Tracing the history of the *Sillon*, Pius X pointed out that the group had begun by proclaiming itself formally Catholic and had argued that without the moral force of Catholicism, true democracy could not exist at all. But as time passed, the *Sillonistes* had changed their position and left to each individual his own religion. For the formula,

"democracy will be Catholic," it had substituted the formula, "democracy will not be anti-Catholic" and had inaugurated the era of the "greater *Sillon*." Thus the *Sillon* had set up what the papacy termed an "interconfessional association" whose purpose was the "reform of civilization."¹² It is useless, continued the letter, for the leader of the *Sillon* to argue that the movement is acting only in the realm of "practical realities" where diversity of beliefs makes no difference, for he knows so well the influence of spiritual convictions on actions that he has invited all men, no matter to what religion they may adhere, "to prove on the ground of practical realizations the excellence of their personal convictions." The Pope denounced this kind of contest in no uncertain terms when he asked,

What is one to think of this appeal to all the heterodox and all the unbelievers to prove the excellence of their convictions in the social realm in a sort of apologetic competition, as if this contest had not been going on for nineteen centuries in conditions less dangerous for the faith of believers and with all honor accruing to the Catholic Church?¹³

It is obvious, concluded the Pope, that the *Sillon's* social action is no longer Catholic. Indeed, the beneficiary of this "cosmopolitan social action" can only be a democracy which will be neither Catholic, nor Protestant, nor Jewish, but a "religion (because *Sillonisme*, according to its leaders, is a religion) more universal than the Catholic Church, uniting all men become brothers and comrades in the 'reign of God'."¹⁴

From the accusation that the *Sillonistes* envisioned "a religion more universal than the Catholic Church," it was easy for the papacy to attribute to the movement certain basic errors in doctrine. These consisted primarily of deviations from the Church's position on the nature of social organization. For example, it was charged that the "Sillonistes" had rejected the doctrine most recently recalled by Pope Leo XIII concerning the essential principles of society by placing "authority in the people or suppressing it almost entirely" and that they had furthermore adopted as their ideal "the levelling of classes." Despite their professed aims of exalting the dignity of the individual, improving the condition of the working classes, and bringing about a reign of greater justice and charity, they were in reality trying to change the natural and traditional foundations of society by promising a "future city" built on principles which they dared to proclaim more fruitful and beneficial than those of the "Christian city" itself.

It was alleged errors such as these which led the Pope to charge that the *Sillon* had been "captured . . . by the modern enemies of the Church" so that it had come to form

. . . one miserable branch of the great movement of apostasy organized in all countries for the establishment of a universal Church which will have no dogmas, no hierarchy, no rule for the spirit, no brake for the passions and which, under pretext of liberty and human dignity, would

lead the world if it could triumph, back to the legal reign of ruse and force, to the oppression of the weak, of those who suffer and labor.¹⁵

To recapitulate, the *Sillon* was suppressed according to the papal letter of 1910 for the following reasons: in the realm of discipline, it had refused to submit to ecclesiastical authority despite the fact that its goals were social and religious as well as civic. Moreover it had subordinated religion to politics and tied Catholicism to the interests of a given political party by its inference that Catholicism favored a democratic form of government. Finally, through its attempt to enlist the support of non-Catholic as well as Catholic groups, it had tried to set up an "interconfessional association" whose end was essentially a moral end, the reform of civilization.

Such conduct would have been reprehensible enough even if the *Sillon* had taught the truth, declared the Pope. But to its errors of conduct had been added the errors of doctrine just enumerated: the desire to place authority in the people or to suppress it almost entirely, the wish to bring about a levelling of classes, and the attempt to alter the natural foundations of society along principles inconsistent with traditional Catholic dogma. There was finally the charge that *Silloniste* doctrine revealed the movement as a part of the modernist heresy that had grown up within the Church.

* * * * *

How did the members of the *Sillon* react to the suppression of the movement in 1910 and to the charges brought against them? Ever since 1906 they had watched the growing opposition of the French episcopacy to their activities, but it appears that the condemnation itself came as a surprise to the leaders of the group as well as to the rank and file. In order to allay the criticism that had been directed against the movement, a re-organization of its activities had been carried out in the spring of 1910 which separated the various functions of the movement into three distinct branches: one for "civic education," one for "social action," and a third for "political action." Only in the third branch was co-operation with non-*Silloniste* groups anticipated. Participation in the other spheres was to be restricted to practicing Catholics who were members of the *Sillon*.¹⁶ The move had been frankly calculated to dissipate whatever confusion had existed with respect to the movement's character up to that time.

The leaders of the movement were not directly notified of the condemnation by the Vatican; rather they learned of it, along with other Parisians, from the conservative Catholic journal *La Croix* whose entire front page on August 30, 1910, was devoted to a "Letter from Our Holy Father Pope Pius X to the Archbishops and Bishops of France." Marc Sangnier and his associates had received no advance warning that the document was to appear. When the news was re-

ceived, a meeting of a few leaders of the movement was called to discuss what measures should be taken. Within a few hours, Sangnier had announced his decision to submit to the papal directive.¹⁷

News of the *Sillon's* condemnation brought a widespread reaction in the press, both in France and abroad, since the movement had gained considerable notoriety, particularly at the time of its public meetings earlier in the decade. In the twenty-four hours following publication of the papal communication, almost every newspaper in France reprinted extracts from the document and interpreted the condemnation in the light of its own views. While journals like *Le Temps* and *Le Figaro* soberly traced the background of the relations between the *Sillon* and the ecclesiastical hierarchy and commented on the implications of the encyclical, extremist papers drew their more sensational conclusions. The Socialist journal *L'Humanité* declared (August 30, 1910) that Marc Sangnier had been "sacrificed to the monarchists, to *L'Autorité* and *L'Action française*, who for years have, with growing rage, been demanding his head." But *L'Action française* itself spoke less of the defeat of the *Sillon* than of the intellectual and moral repercussions of the encyclical, adding that not since the *Syllabus* of Pius IX had "revolutionary doctrines been condemned with as much precision and clarity."¹⁸ Finally, an anticlerical paper like *La Lanterne* was jubilant as it told of the condemnation of the "heretics of the *Sillon*"

For some time past, a few Utopians have been trying adroitly to reconcile the Catholic and Roman religion with democracy. Several young people dared to risk the remarkable attempt to "situate Catholics among democrats," but the bishops were watching and Rome had finally to stop by a brutal *veto* the demagogic movement of the *Sillonistes*. Thus it is the Pope himself who recalls with the imperious voice of all his predecessors, that one must choose between the Church and democracy...¹⁹

It was partly in response to comments such as the one just quoted that Marc Sangnier addressed a letter to the Vatican shortly after the encyclical had appeared in which he announced his total compliance with the orders of the papacy and his retirement from the organizations which composed the *Sillon*.²⁰ He intimated strongly, however, that he personally would continue to engage in political activity and gave as one of his reasons for refusing to abandon a public career that it would "tend to give credit in France among the enemies of religion to the obviously false and dangerous idea that a Catholic cannot, with a safe conscience, remain a republican and a democrat. . . ."²¹

It may well be asked whether, despite his gesture of submission, Sangnier considered the charges against the movement unjust. Certainly there is in his letter the inference that a number of accusations brought against the group, particularly the suggestion that it formed part of a vast, modernist conspiracy, were based on distorted infor-

mation. And this sentiment was echoed a few days later by Henry du Roure, one of Sangnier's closest associates, when he wrote in a private letter,

There are obviously accusations in the Pope's letter which do not correspond to our true ideas and feelings. But after all, our error is to have let it be understood that we held these views.²²

Regardless of the immediate reaction of the *Sillonistes*, an important question remains: to what extent did the "errors" attributed to the *Sillon* by the papal encyclical actually correspond with the ideas of the movement as expressed in its publications or the speeches of its leaders? Such a question does not admit of a simple answer, requiring as it does a familiarity with material published over a period of fifteen years and an awareness of the inconsistencies and contradictions inherent in a doctrine which changed as the movement itself expanded. A further complication is suggested by Du Roure's remark quoted above—" . . . our error is to have let it be understood that we held these views." For Marc Sangnier and his followers had tended throughout the history of the movement to make a virtue of imprecision and vagueness in their public declarations, arguing that the "future alone" could determine the nature of their doctrine and the character of the society towards which they were striving. On one occasion Sangnier, replying to charges of imprecision in the *Sillon's* doctrine, wrote,

Let no one be mistaken: in reproaching us for the scarcity of precise statements that issue from our efforts, one forgets that this is perhaps the best sign of our positive spirit, the best guarantee of the scientific probity of our method We believe that it is preferable to allow ourselves to be formed by the future [de se laisser faire par l'avenir] which is inevitably being elaborated within each one of us . . .²³

Such an outlook clearly makes a systematic analysis of *Silloniste* doctrine difficult; what is more, the equivocal, semi-mystical and often contradictory formulas that made up the *Sillon's* program provided its enemies with admirable weapons by means of which they could incriminate the movement with ecclesiastical authorities.

Despite these numerous difficulties, it is still possible to draw a distinction between the two categories of charges brought against the *Sillon* in an attempt to assess their validity. To the present writer it appears that the *Sillon* was to a much greater extent guilty of the "disciplinary errors" with which it was charged than with what have been termed the "doctrinal errors." It should be repeated that the two are difficult to separate, but it is still possible to draw a distinction between action or intended action on the one hand and the theoretical pronouncements of the group on the other. The disciplinary charges brought against the movement were, as has been stated, that it had refused to submit to ecclesiastical authority, that it had tied

Catholicism to the interests of a given political group, and that it had attempted to enlist the support of non-Catholic groups in its "greater *Sillon*."

All of these charges rested on a basic assumption concerning the nature of the movement itself, namely that it was a partially religious association because its aims were at the same time moral as well as political, spiritual as well as temporal. If this assumption were admitted, it followed that the movement could rightly be termed a Catholic grouping and therefore subject to ecclesiastical supervision. This traditional principle of the Church was recognized by Sangnier himself on more than one occasion and, in the earlier years of the *Sillon*'s history, he was frank to characterize the movement as a Catholic enterprise whose purpose was the restoration of the Church's influence among the working classes.²⁴ It was only beginning in 1902 and particularly in the final phase of the movement's history after 1905 that Sangnier began to equivocate about the nature of the group and to argue that the *Sillon* was essentially a group of Catholic laymen pursuing political and temporal ends and that it did not, therefore, fall under the jurisdiction of the episcopacy.²⁵ A group of Catholic citizens, argued Sangnier, was perfectly free to form a political party devoted to the achievement of a "true democratic republic" in France, as long as the party did not claim to be acting in the name of the Church itself which was traditionally indifferent to forms of government.

The error with which the *Sillonistes* were charged, however, was not that they were attempting to pursue democratic goals but rather that they refused to abandon the moral and spiritual aims which had characterized the movement from the beginning. And the justice of this accusation appears to this writer beyond question. For much as they might protest the non-religious character of their ends in the years after 1905, they still believed that a "moral revolution" within each individual must precede the advent of any genuinely democratic society. Although the outward activities of the *Sillon* changed and although they argued that they merely drew their inspiration from their religion, their fundamental purpose remained the same: "to increase the intellectual and moral worth of each human being and to develop at the same time love among men."²⁶ Such an end, in the eyes of the Church, was as much religious as political.

The *Sillon* was indeed guilty, in the opinion of this writer, of the "politico-religious confusion" with which it has been charged, particularly in the years after 1905. And it is for this reason that the disciplinary charges brought against the group were in large part justified, given the criteria by which the Church was operating. In the

view of the Church and in the eyes of the public, the *Sillon* remained an essentially Catholic grouping. By its open call for a "democratic republic," it did indeed appear that the *Sillonistes* wished to bind the Church in France to the cause of democracy.

When one turns to the so-called "doctrinal errors" of the *Sillon*, however, there seems to be much less foundation for the accusations made by the papacy. Whether the Vatican was at fault or whether it was simply misinformed, it is clear that careful selection, exaggeration and even wilful distortion of statements of the *Sillonistes* were employed in the encyclical in order to incriminate the movement. For Marc Sangnier's warm and effusive appeals for an era of greater justice and equality among men are interpreted in the encyclical as assertions that "every inequality is an injustice" and that "democracy alone can inaugurate a reign of perfect justice." His demand that the ruling classes remain open to accessions from below is viewed as a desire on the part of the *Sillon* for the "levelling of classes," a goal which Sangnier would have been quick to disavow. Undoubtedly the imprecision of Sangnier's declarations, to which reference has been made, invited this sort of misinterpretation, but for every "error" singled out in the papal letter, it would have been easy to find statements by Sangnier or his followers proving the orthodoxy of their views on the particular issue in question.²⁷ And the inference of the papal letter that the *Sillonistes'* intention was to challenge basic Catholic dogma would have been hotly rejected by them and must be dismissed by anyone who has made a careful study of their published works. So twisted were the charges against the movement concerning its "modernist tendencies" that Sangnier felt called upon to reject them specifically in his letter of submission to Pius X,

We know better than anyone how weak we are, how subject to errors and faults. But, Very Holy Father, our heart was pierced through with cruel distress when we saw ourselves accused of having wanted to found "a religion more universal than the Catholic Church" and of having practiced "a deformation of the Gospel and of the sacred character of Our Lord Jesus Christ." That we could have, even involuntarily, given rise to such reproaches is what strikes us with the most painful stupor.²⁸

* * * * *

One may legitimately inquire why the Vatican in the year 1910 saw fit to add to its substantial indictment of the *Sillon* on disciplinary grounds these supplementary charges of unorthodoxy. It is, of course, close to impossible to determine the precise influences which were brought to bear on the papacy in this situation, and speculation on the Vatican's motives for issuing the encyclical at this time must remain to a large extent conjectural.

It was suggested by a number of former *Sillonistes* in the years immediately following the condemnation—and the explanation is

still offered today—that the suppression of the movement was the result of a carefully executed plot on the part of enemies of the group who brought pressure to bear on the French episcopacy as well as on the Vatican itself. Such a “thèse de complot” remains difficult to substantiate although there is little question that among the advisers of Pius X were men of extremely conservative political views who would naturally have been ill-disposed towards a movement of the *Sillon's* character.

But it is a matter of public record that royalist leaders, Charles Maurras in particular, were active over a number of years in their attacks on the *Sillon*. And equally damaging were attempts on the part of certain conservative theologians to bring the orthodoxy of the movement into question. Foremost among the latter was Abbé Emmanuel Barbier, an ex-Jesuit and a writer of considerable talent, who appears to have considered the incrimination of the *Sillon* with ecclesiastical authorities his chief task in the years following 1905. Between that year and 1910, he published no less than three substantial books and one pamphlet in which, as a trained theologian, he exposed alleged doctrinal errors in the *Sillon's* ideology.²⁹ Although Abbé Barbier had already acquired a reputation as an anti-liberal theologian for his criticism of the policies of Pope Leo XIII, there is little question that his works were of some significance in turning numbers of the French episcopacy against the *Sillon*.

But to conclude from this that the suppression of the *Sillon* resulted solely from the machinations of a determined and sinister knot of reactionaries appears a serious misrepresentation of the facts. For the condemnation in 1910 of a movement which purported to be both Christian and democratic was a move that formed part of a larger pattern of action pursued by the Church at the time.

Judged by any standards, the decade from 1900 to 1910 was a difficult period for the Church in France. Without entering into the problem of the origins of the Church-State controversy of this era, it is still possible to assert that French Catholics found themselves fighting off one of the most vigorous anticlerical onslaughts the Church has experienced in recent times. When Pius X ascended the papal throne in 1903, he found the French government dispersing the religious orders and closing Catholic schools. Within two years he saw the century-old Concordat repudiated by the Republic and the French clergy deprived of state support. It is hardly surprising, in view of these events, that the new pope made little attempt to continue the policy of reconciliation with the Republic pursued by his predecessor Leo XIII. The key to Vatican policy in France, particularly after the separation of Church and State, lay in its demand for an absolute

union of Catholic forces in defense of the Church's interests. This solicitude for the unity of the faithful appeared in the encyclical issued by Pius X in 1906 following the Separation of Church and State (*Vehementer nos*) when he called upon French Catholics to unite more strongly in defense of their faith against those whose aim was no less than to "decatholicize" France. And the admonition to unite was repeated a year later in the celebrated papal condemnation of "modernist" doctrines entitled *Pascendi*.

The papal view which found expression in these two documents is important because it goes a long way towards explaining the attitude of many members of the French hierarchy towards the *Sillon* in the final years of its existence. There were, of course, prominent Catholics who questioned the wisdom of certain aspects of the Vatican's policy at this time, particularly the intransigence of the Pope in his dealings with the Republic, but the majority of the episcopacy saw the necessity for Catholics to present a united front in defense of the Church's interests. Whatever group or whatever individuals openly threatened that unity were apt to be looked upon with disfavor by the hierarchy.

In the political realm, such a policy demanded that all Catholics, regardless of their previous political opinions, should rally to the support of those candidates for public office who pledged themselves openly to support the Church's interests. In this situation the attitude of the *Sillon's* leaders came to be of critical importance. For, in effect, they chose to ignore the call of the Vatican for unified political action, and their refusal to collaborate with their coreligionists in the electoral sphere accounts to a great extent for the antagonism the movement aroused among church authorities.

Particularly significant in this respect was the attitude taken by the *Sillonistes* in the national elections of 1906 that followed closely upon the Separation. Up until this year the *Sillonistes* had repeatedly asserted that they would abstain from conventional political action as a matter of principle since mere elections could not bring about the moral and social reform essential to the kind of democracy they envisaged. But a combination of circumstances arising in the year 1906 contributed to Marc Sangnier's decision that the movement should take a more active interest in practical politics. One of the most important episodes in this respect was the reaction of certain Catholic groups to the inventories of ecclesiastical property undertaken by the State in the spring of 1906 in accordance with the provisions of the Separation Law. Because lay agents of the State were required to handle and evaluate sacred objects within the churches, there was considerable resentment on the part of Catholics in general and active resistance on

the part of some royalists who were not averse to making a political issue of the whole affair. The *Sillon*, on the other hand, formally offered its services to the clergy but refrained from resisting the government agents.

The episode is significant in this context only because it brought to a climax the rivalry that had existed for more than two years between the *Sillon* and Charles Maurras' *Action française*, the most active royalist group, and because it led Sangnier to the conviction that the *Sillon* must take a more active role in politics if it were to prevent French Catholics from falling under the domination of the extreme right-wing.

Such a decision came too late for the *Sillon* to engage in independent political action in the legislative elections of May, 1906, but Sangnier decided, after the incidents provoked by the inventory, to proclaim the *Sillon's* neutrality in those elections. Such a decision was bolder than might appear at first glance since there was in existence at the time at least one political grouping, the *Action Libérale Populaire*, which was making defense of the Church's interests the central plank of its platform, and Church authorities were strongly recommending that the faithful rally to the support of its candidates or of any others campaigning on a similar platform.³⁰

Sangnier's reasons for refusing to throw the support of the *Sillon* behind the *Action Libérale Populaire*, a relatively moderate political group acting on behalf of the Church, are interesting because they reveal a growing awareness on his part of some of the problems involved in Catholic political action. In an article that appeared in the *Sillon's* journal at this time, the leader of the movement specified in some detail the reasons for his position.³¹ After pointing out some of the shortcomings of the *Action Libérale Populaire* and criticizing its equivocal position during the "inventory riots," he declared what he believed to be the basic weakness of any such grouping, namely that its leaders were not free to express clearly their political and social views because of their desire to attract as broad a political representation as possible. With both royalists and republicans in the same party, the leaders were forced to equivocate, which meant that neither group was satisfied with the party program. Such a Catholic coalition might survive the coming election, he argued, but it would be more difficult for it to endure afterwards.

A major threat to the *Action Libérale Populaire*, continued Sangnier, lay in the growing influence of the monarchists among Catholics. This was the natural result of the bitterness following the Law on the Separation of Church and State and the implementation of that law by the government of the Republic. But it was obvious, wrote Sang-

nier, that the royalists would be pressing to gain control of any Catholic political group and would call for the creation of a "Catholic Party" in order to exploit it for their own ends. Given this situation, Sangnier put succinctly the alternative types of political action that he thought lay before his coreligionists at the time.

Either we shall have a *Parti catholique* under the direct control of the clergy and the bishops, . . . or, with all Catholics being grouped in the religious sphere around their legitimate pastors, each one will be permitted in the political and social sphere to use his freedom as he sees fit. This will give rise to several groups with distinct and opposing temperaments, tendencies, and methods, from which the bishops will require only respect for dogmas, for religious discipline and also for the moral and social teachings of the Church which are *catholic*, that is, established for all times and places.³²

In this declaration Sangnier formulated the view of Catholic political action which the *Sillon* was to hold for the remaining years of its existence. Catholic citizens should be free to follow their own political convictions and to form parties embodying their beliefs so long as these parties respected the moral and religious teachings of the Church. Above all, the *Sillon* opposed the idea of a single "Catholic Party" to which all Catholics would be invited to adhere, a grouping which would be concerned primarily with religious interests.

* * * * *

Unfortunately for the *Sillon* this view of Catholic political action did not coincide with that held by the French hierarchy or the Vatican at the time and, as a result, the movement incurred the enmity of many Catholics, both clergy and laymen, who had hitherto been disposed in its favor. It has been argued that the reason for the growing opposition to the *Sillon* lay in the predominantly conservative or royalist sympathies of the most influential Catholic prelates of the era who could not tolerate this unconventional group of young men posing simultaneously as Christians and Democrats. Certainly there was enough of this sentiment in existence so that it may be classified as a contributory element in the mounting antagonism to the group after 1906, but it would be erroneous to consider it the major cause for the suppression of the movement.

An analysis of the character of the French episcopacy in this decade reveals, on the contrary, that it was not as overwhelmingly conservative as has been generally assumed, since most of the incumbent bishops had been named during the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII with the approval of the French state and a good many of them had been appointed with a view to advancing Leo's policy of reconciliation with the Republic.³³ Naturally the spate of anticlerical legislation that culminated in the rupture of the Concordat had served to modify the views of the bishops towards the Republic, but most un-

doubtedly realized the futility of continuing agitation for a restoration of the monarchy.

More important in explaining the growing opposition of the episcopacy to the *Sillon* was the impetus towards unity to which reference has already been made. Disagree as they might over questions of the policy to be pursued with respect to the Separation Law, the bishops still recognized the need for Catholics to present a united front in dealing with the opposition. Therefore, to the extent that the *Sillon* sowed disunity among the faithful its activities came to be deplored by the bishops. And it can hardly be denied that the movement was guilty of creating dissension among Catholics after 1905, although its leaders might argue that it was their reactionary opponents rather than they who were responsible for the situation. Whoever was responsible, the *Sillonistes* began to see as many enemies on the Right as on the Left, and of course their opponents on the Right were apt to be practicing Catholics.

If the *Sillon* was to maintain whatever support it had from the French hierarchy after 1906, considerable tact was required in its dealings with the episcopacy. Yet on more than one occasion, open disputes with bishops who had publicly criticized the *Sillon* served further to alienate those who had formerly been well-disposed towards the group. In short, the movement in its final years acquired a reputation for fractiousness and trouble-making which, though often undeserved, did nothing to raise its stock in Rome.

Another cause for the Church's discontent with the *Sillon* lay in the repeated emphasis which its leaders placed upon reform and innovation whether in the political or social sphere. In fact, a close examination of Sangnier's published works reveals that he also gave an important place to tradition and a regard for the past in his total outlook, but such beliefs were usually overshadowed by his calls for change. In any case, such an emphasis ran counter to the overall policy pursued by Pius X which stressed the preservation and consolidation of Catholic tradition and was generally characterized by an attitude of resistance to change.³⁴ The encyclical on modernism issued in 1907 was perhaps the most obvious manifestation of this general outlook, but it was far from isolated.

Seen in the above context, the papal opposition to the *Sillon* is more easily understood. For the *Sillonistes* appeared to contravene in their actions the two basic principles of the papal policy in France: on the one hand, they threatened the unity of French Catholics; on the other hand, their program appeared to embody the kind of change and innovation which the Vatican was, at least for the moment, trying to resist. The attacks of the *Sillonistes* on their coreligionists, their

independence with respect to the episcopacy, and their appeal for collaboration with non-Catholics could not help arousing the Pope's antipathy. Because the majority of French Catholics were still socially and politically conservative, it was felt that this was no time to tolerate an aggressive group of Catholic democrats who were ready to do battle with opponents more often Catholic than not.

Why it was necessary for the Vatican to condemn the *Sillon* on doctrinal grounds is less easy to explain, but it is probably here that the influence of conservative theologians like Abbé Barbier was the greatest. The Church had not yet recovered in 1910 from the "modernist crisis" and there were still many self-appointed censors ready to find modernist "heresies" wherever they looked and to bring the suspected parties into disrepute with the papacy. Whether or not the Vatican actually believed it, many of the faithful were convinced that every Catholic group with liberal tendencies, whether political, social, or theological, belonged to the same vast and dangerous conspiracy bent on undermining the authority of the Church. By identifying the *Sillon* with "this movement of organized apostasy" rather than simply charging it with indiscretion and errors of discipline, Sangnier and his followers could be made to appear much more dangerous to the Church.

Not long after the papal letter condemning the *Sillon* appeared, Msgr. Eyssautier, Bishop of Rochelle, pointed out that Pius X had not condemned democracy as such but only "democracy as understood by the *Sillon*,"³⁵ and a number of Catholic writers reiterated this argument. Yet many contemporary observers interpreted the suppression of the *Sillon* as an assertion on the part of the Vatican that a basic incompatibility existed between Catholicism and Democracy, that it was impossible for a loyal Catholic to be at the same time a sincere democrat. Moreover the exultation of the *Action Française* and of similar groups over the papal letter appeared to confirm such a conclusion.

It is beyond the scope of the present study to examine this broader question of the alleged irreconcilability between Catholic doctrine and modern democratic principles, legitimate though such an inquiry may be.³⁶ For it is the opinion of this writer, as stated above, that the *Sillon* was suppressed less for ideological than for tactical reasons. Nevertheless it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the condemnation of the *Sillon* dealt a serious blow to the cause of Christian-Democracy in France and elsewhere. For as long as the view which inspired the condemnation continued to prevail at the Vatican, the chances for survival of any Catholic democratic group—whether similar to the *Sillon* or not—were slim indeed.

Moreover the condemnation of the *Sillon* seemed to raise certain basic questions concerning Catholic political action for the future. It was still theoretically possible for a group of Catholic laymen to organize for independent political action, but did not the Church reserve the right to decide when such action transcended the purely political and therefore became a matter for ecclesiastical supervision? Was such independent political action on the part of Catholic laymen to be permitted only to those groups whose views coincided with those of the majority of Catholics in a given country or with the prevailing views of the Vatican? Technically, the answers which the experience of the *Sillon* appeared to provide to these questions were applicable to the case of the *Sillon* alone, but they were sufficient to discourage any significant political activity on the part of Christian-Democrats in France for more than a generation after 1910.

1. For a good recent study of this subject, see Philip Williams, *Politics in Post-war France* (London, 1954), 77-89.

2. See, for example, *Les origines du M. R. P. et sa mission dans la vie politique française* (Paris, 1951), a pamphlet published by the M. R. P. For another brief account of the M. R. P.'s beginnings, see Mario Einaudi and François Goguel, *Christian Democracy in Italy and France* (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1952). The only general treatment of the development of Christian-Democracy in France is so hostile as to be practically worthless: Robert Havard de la Montagne, *Histoire de la démocratie chrétienne de Lamennais à Georges Bidault* (Paris, n. d.).

3. *Les Origines du M. R. P.*, 16.

4. On the *Sillon*, see the present writer's unpublished doctoral dissertation, *The Sillon of Marc Sangnier: Christian-Democracy in France (1894-1910)* (April, 1953) deposited in the Harvard University Library. See also Adrien Dansette, "Rejuvenation of French Catholicism: Marc Sangnier's Sillon," *Review of Politics*, XV (1953), 34-52. Dansette's article is based on a chapter from his *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine* (Paris, 1951), II. An examination of the circumstances contributing to the suppression of the movement is contained in James H. Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia, 1951), 164-74. The only other publication of any merit on the *Sillon* is a special issue of the *Chronique sociale de France*, 60e année (1950) devoted to a collection of ten articles on "Le Cinquantenaire du Sillon." See also the chapter on the *Sillon* in Hermann Platz, *Geistige Kämpfe im modernen Frankreich* (München, 1922). On Marc Sangnier no biography exists, but see *Marc Sangnier: Témoignages*

rassemblés par les soins de l'office de Publicité Générale, 37, rue de Lille - Paris - 7e et de la Librairie Bloud & Gay, 3, rue Garancière - Paris - 6e (Paris, 1950).

5. For details on this and other Social Catholic movements at the end of the nineteenth century, see Henri Rollet, *L'Action sociale des catholiques en France (1871-1901)* (Paris, n. d.). On Christian-Democratic movements of this era, see Robert F. Byrnes, "The French Christian-Democrats in the 1890's: their Appearance and their Failure," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXXVI (1950-51), 286-306. See also the chapter by the same author, "The Christian Democrats in Modern France" in Edward M. Earle, ed., *Modern France: Problems of the Third and Fourth Republics* (Princeton, 1951), 153-78.

6. Estimates on the membership vary greatly since no formal adherence to the organization was required. This figure is based on the circulation of the *Sillon's* journal and periodicals as well as on statements by its leaders.

7. This he did in 1909 and 1910, but on both occasions he was unsuccessful. Sangnier did not enter the Chamber until after World War I. See Marc Sangnier, *Une expérience; La Campagne électorale dans la 4e circonscription de Sceaux, 24 février - 4 avril 1909* (Paris, 1909).

8. Pius X, Pope, "Lettre aux Archevêques et Evêques Français," *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, II, 16 (1910), 607-633. An inadequate translation of the letter appeared in the *American Catholic Quarterly*, XXXV (1910), 693-711. All translations here are my own.

9. *Ibid.*, 610.

10. The term "confusionnisme politico-religieux" is used in connection with the *Sillon* by Joseph Polliet, "Essai

- de jugement équitable sur le Sillon" in *Chronique sociale de France*, 60e année (1950), 126.
11. Pius X, "Lettre . . . , etc.," 623.
 12. *Ibid.*, 625.
 13. *Ibid.*, 626.
 14. *Ibid.*, 626.
 15. *Ibid.*, 628.
 16. See the *Sillon's* newspaper *L'Eveil démocratique*, IV (sér. heb.), 101 (May 29, 1910).
 17. Personal interview with Jacques Rödel (Paris, 1951), one of Sangnier's colleagues present at the meeting.
 18. *L'Action française* (Paris), August 30, 1910.
 19. *La Lanterne* (Paris), August 31, 1910.
 20. The letter appeared in the *Sillon's* daily newspaper *La Démocratie* (Paris), August 31, 1910.
 21. *Ibid.* True to his resolution, Sangnier continued to publish the newspaper *La Démocratie* adhering to the condition imposed by the Vatican that the paper should "abstain scrupulously from all propaganda in favor of the theories, the principles and the movement censured . . ." (Letter from Cardinal Merry del Val, papal Secretary of State, reprinted in *La Démocratie*, September 11, 1910). In 1923 he founded the "Ligue de la Jeune République," a new political group that appealed to all "democrats respectful of moral and religious forces." Although the war put a temporary halt to both these enterprises, they were revived in 1919 and the "Jeune République" is still in existence today. After World War I, Sangnier's energies were devoted to the pacifist movement and in the 1930's he organized the *Ligue française pour les Auberges de la jeunesse*. He was arrested and imprisoned during World War II for putting the presses of *La Démocratie* at the disposal of an underground journal. As noted above, he became Honorary President of the M. R. P. after World War II, a post which he held until his death in 1950.
 22. Léonard Constant, *Henry du Roure* (Paris, n. d.), 111. Letter to Mme. du Roure, September 3, 1910.
 23. *Le Sillon*, X, 7 (April 10, 1903), 242.
 24. See, for example, a speech delivered in 1900 when he announced as the aim of the *Sillon's* popular education enterprise to "...open the minds of that indeterminate, changing, variable crowd that has too long escaped Catholic influence, but which we have the mission of leading back to Christ." (Marc Sangnier, *Discours* [Paris, 1910], I, 73). As late as 1904 the goal of the *Sillon's* study-circles was characterized as, "...the formation of a Catholic elite . . ." (*Almanach du Sillon; ... Année 1904* [Paris, n. d.], 17).
 25. The successive changes in the title of *Le Sillon*, the review published by the movement, are significant in this connection. Early in 1905, *Le Sillon* changed its sub-title from *Revue catholique d'action sociale* to *Revue d'action démocratique*.
 26. L. Constant and A. Guiard, *Les journées sillonistes de Soisy sur-Ecole* (2-8 septembre 1907) (Paris, 1907), 19.
 27. Precisely this sort of comparison was made between statements of the French bishops quoted by Albert Monriot, "*Le Sillon*" devant l'épiscopat: 52 consultations de Cardinaux, Archevêques et Evêques (Paris, n. d.) and statements extracted from *Le Sillon* and Marc Sangnier's works. These were published in a work printed for limited distribution: *Le Sillon, Nos Dossiers* (n. p. n. d.).
 28. *La Démocratie* (Paris), August 31, 1910.
 29. Emmanuel Barbier, *Les idées du Sillon: Etude critique* (Poitiers, n. d. [1905]); *Les erreurs du Sillon* (Poitiers, n. d. [1906]); *La décadence du Sillon* (Nancy, 1908).
 30. On the *Action Libérale Populaire*, see the study by Parker T. Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France* (New York, 1921).
 31. *L'Eveil démocratique*, I, 13 (April 1, 1906).
 32. *Ibid.*
 33. On the character of the French episcopacy in this era, see le R. P. Lecanuet, *La Vie de l'église sous Léon XIII* (Paris, 1930). See also J. Brugerette, *Le Prêtre français et la société contemporaine* (3 vols., Paris, 1938).
 34. On this general question, see Alec R. Vidler, *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church* (Cambridge, 1934), *passim*.
 35. *Le Temps* (Paris), September 4, 1910. See also Julien Narfon, "Pie X a-t-il condamné le régime démocratique?" in *Le Figaro* (Paris), September 4, 1910.
 36. For a recent study of this problem, see relevant chapters in James H. Nichols, *Democracy and the Churches* (Philadelphia, 1951).

THE SACRAMENTAL PRESUPPOSITIONS OF ANSELM'S *CUR DEUS HOMO**

GEORGE HUNTSTON WILLIAMS, *Winn Professor of
Ecclesiastical History, Harvard Divinity School*

The completion of F. S. Schmitt's critical edition of the *Opera omnia*¹ of St. Anselm of Canterbury, with its elimination of a good many spurious meditations and prayers and with its recalendaring of the old and the newly identified correspondence, has stimulated widespread interest in the father of scholasticism. In the present study I wish to show that Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* is a "penitential-eucharistic," as distinguished from a "baptismal," theory of the atonement.² This is a terminology which must be explained at once.

I. INTRODUCTION

RITUAL AND REDEMPTION: THE ECOLOGY OF THE SACRAMENTS

In the ancient Church catechumens, after a prolonged ritual of exorcism, baptism, and anointment (later differentiated as confirmation), went directly to participate in their first communion, a foretaste of the messianic or heavenly banquet.

In the medieval Church, when baptism had become largely a sacrament of infancy, access to the communion was seldom direct; the sacrament of penance had gradually interposed itself between infant baptism and the eucharist.

It is the purpose of this paper to show that with the shift from the ancient baptismal to the medieval penitential approach there came a gradual change of perspective in interpreting the redemptive, historic act behind the eucharist, namely, the crucifixion and the atonement. Since the theological formulation of the *objective*, cosmic-historic act of atonement is bound in a measure to reflect the prevailing *subjective*, experiential, sacramental means of appropriating the effects of that act, the *Cur Deus Homo* may be seen as the first consistent formulation of a "penitential-eucharistic" theory of the atonement coming after a millennium of evolution in the sacral life of the Western Church.

It is the strictly rationalist character of Anselm's demonstration which has hitherto tended to divert attention from the sacramental presuppositions of the theory of redemption contained in *Cur Deus Homo*. Many historians of dogma and most systematic theologians have been content to analyze the *Cur Deus Homo* in terms of early

*The substance of this paper was read at the 71st annual meeting of the American Historical Association, St. Louis, December 30, 1956.

scholastic logic without reference to the sacramental and disciplinary life of the eleventh-century Church.

Those who have cultivated the historical background have, to be sure, brought to our attention the influence of Irish and German legal concepts of commutations or redemptions expressive of the varying worth of the offended party,³ the Germanic feudal idea of personal honor, and the transfer of the legal language of the sacrament of penance to the atonement.⁴ More recently our attention has been drawn to the continuity of themes in the medieval Christian-Jewish disputations in which the *Cur Deus Homo* can be made to fit.⁵ The *Cur Deus Homo* has also been seen afresh as the final triumph of the Latin legal view of the Christian life over the "classical," largely Greek, idea of the atonement as the victorious struggle of God or of *Christus victor* with the demonic powers.⁶ Another critic has pointed out that the *Cur Deus Homo* is an aspect of the eleventh-century recovery of an interest in man as an end in himself;⁷ another, that instead of being a treatise on the atonement the *Cur Deus Homo* is primarily a fresh and constructive Christology, closely linked with Anselm's concern for God as Creator as well as Redeemer;⁸ another, that the *Cur Deus Homo* is a theological witness to the general shift at the turn of the eleventh century from the epic to the romantic;⁹ and most recently, that too much attention to the origins and antecedents of Anselm's soteriology has obscured his spiritual independence from his own rather harsh analogies and has failed to bring out the distinctiveness of his "evangelical" transformation of feudal, penitential, and scholastic language in a clear perception of the *aseitas* of God and his grace.¹⁰

Drawing upon all these interpretations where they seem well founded, I should like to throw further light upon the *Cur Deus Homo* in explaining it as a penitential-eucharistic or simply a eucharistic theory.

Similarly we shall simplify the corresponding term for antiquity as the baptismal view. Thereby we sharpen the contrast between the two perspectives, since both baptism and the eucharist, in contrast to the other sacraments, are in a way "competitive" symbols of the redemptive action of the crucifixion and the resurrection; and although both are Dominical and Apostolic, each from the beginning might claim to be the preëminent, if not the exclusive, sacramental means of appropriating the work of redemption.¹¹ Clearly they have been rivals in supplying the imagery, the vocabulary, and the categories for the theoretical exposition of the doctrine of redemption.

Preoccupation with the mystery of baptism which is a once-for-all sacrament has tended to yield a theory of the atonement universal in its scope, comparable to the escape from the Flood or the crossing of

the Red Sea, and has stressed the cosmic and decisive character of Christ's liberation of mankind from death and the demonic.

Preoccupation with the mystery of the eucharist which is a repetitive sacrament tends, in contrast, to yield a theory of the atonement which stresses the obedience of Christ and the progressive character of man's redemptive incorporation into Christ by means of the divine nutriment of the altar.

This eucharistic history, though its beginnings are Pauline and patristic, has its most congenial setting in the liturgy and disciplinary practices of the medieval monastery and minster after a millennium of evolution in sacramental theology and the gradual disaggregation of the mystery of the new life in Christ into a system of disparate sacraments, somewhat dissociated from the liturgical year and converted into conduits of grace appropriate to the various moments in the spiritual calendar of the individual.

The baptismal theories of the atonement, in contrast, had their setting in the undifferentiated sacral life of the ancient Church, which centered in the annual celebration of the mystery of the crucifixion and the resurrection with its *collective* baptismal initiation of the catechumens.

Even after the peace of Constantine, baptism was often postponed in fully Christian households until the years of discretion in order to keep its healing and vivifying waters for the cleansing of the fully exfoliated sinfulness of maturity. Thus in the ancient Church most theologians looked back upon the redemptive action of Christ on Calvary through eyes sharpened by the extended rite of believers' baptism. Inextricably bound up with the rite were their various classical baptismal formulations of salvation which centered in God's conquest of the devil through *Christus victor*,¹² to whom the believers joined themselves in the solemn renunciation of Satan and a sacramental death. For example, Cyprian, even though he himself practiced infant baptism, likening the devil to Pharaoh and the passage through the Red Sea to baptism, wrote that when believers "come to the water of salvation and to the sanctification of baptism, we ought to know and to trust that there the devil is beaten down, and the man, dedicated to God, is set free by the divine mercy."¹³

In all "baptismal theories" of the atonement, the devil played one of two unwitting roles. According to one view he was paid a ransom because of his proper claims to his prisoners taken in the cosmic warfare over the souls of men, between himself and God. According to the other view the devil was fooled by God into encompassing the death of the one Man upon whom he had no claim; since Christ was sinless or altogether righteous according to the law. Therefore the devil

had to forfeit his right to put to death all other men insofar as they could, through sacramental "death" with him, pay individually for the punishment meted out to all the sons of Adam. Here fitted in the famous homiletical extravagances of Augustine's Blood-baited mouse-trap and Gregory of Nyssa's Flesh-baited cross to hook the Dragon of the deep.

In contrast, the medieval penitential-eucharist theory of salvation came to find its center in Man's conquest of the devil through *Christus patiens*, with whose expiatory action of utter obedience even unto death the (baptismally qualified) believer identified himself in the repetitive sacramental reënactment of Calvary on the altar. The first systematic articulation of this eucharistic theory came when, in the eleventh century, an alert theologian dropped as inadequate a theory of God's ransom to or trickery toward the devil connected with ancient conceptions of testamentary believers' baptism and argued for a theory of redemption reflecting the enhanced significance of repetitive private penance and daily monastic and private masses. In Anselm's eucharistic theory the devil is in a sense replaced by God. As Anselm says in *Cur Deus Homo* (II, xix), "God owed the devil nothing but punishment, and man owed him nothing but retaliation, reconquering him by whom he had been conquered; but whatever was required from man was due to God, not to the devil." On the subjective side of the atonement in the penitential-eucharistic view, the concern is no longer with the renunciation of the demons of one's pre-conversion life but with the fulfilment of penance for one's post-baptismal sins.

II. BAPTISMAL REDEMPTION: ST. ATHANASIUS

It will be well to have one representative baptismal theory¹⁴ of redemption more clearly in mind before taking up Anselm's eucharistic theory in detail. Robert S. Franks some time back saw clearly that the doctrine of redemption from the devil once had practical significance in relation to the exorcism and the renunciation of the devil which accompanied the rite of baptism in the ancient Church.¹⁵

Several recent studies have notably enlarged our understanding of the Judæo-Christian demonology and the primacy of baptism in the ancient Church as the sacramental means whereby the catechumens appropriated the redemptive work of Christ by submitting to elaborate and repeated exorcisms, by renouncing Satan and the would-be triumphal pomp of all the demonic host of the dethroned deities of paganism,¹⁶ by swearing, in the presence of the good angels,¹⁷ sacramental allegiance to Christ in the struggle with Satan, by going down with Christ into the waters of baptism to overcome the dragon of the deep, by dying to this world to rise with him in a new birth and thus cheating Satan of his right to inflict a *definitive* death. Christ's own descent into Hades between his expiration on the cross and the resur-

rection, a descent which was in a sense reenacted symbolically in the plunge into the waters of the baptistry,¹⁸ was understood by many as the deliverance of the captives from the clutches of the devil. (In due course it was reconceived as also having effected the deliverance of all the righteous before the advent of Christ and in this new sense made an article of the baptismal creed.¹⁹) Second-century Hermas even held that the apostles and teachers descended after death *ad inferos* to baptize the departed saints of pre-Christian times, for it was baptism which incorporated the believer by rebirth into the Body of Christ, the Church.

Athanasius may be taken here as the representative formulator of a baptismal theory of the atonement. In *De incarnatione Verbi Dei*, the nearest patristic parallel to Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, Athanasius interpreted redemption preëminently in terms of the incarnation whereby the Word hallowed, by his presence in the one body, the fallen bodies of all the progeny of Adam. King of the universe, he took flesh to dwell in the Satan-besieged city of man (ix). The Word appropriated (*idiopoioumai*) the human body with which to become manifest among men and with which to die, to the end that through baptism men might appropriate his death for the death to which they are liable because of Adam's transgression and thus, having submitted once for all to the primal sentence of death by a *sacramental death*, to be free for that consummation of the resurrection already begun in the baptismal rebirth.²⁰

The conflation of three passages from *De incarnatione* and *Oratio III contra Arianos* will allow Athanasius himself to summarize a typical "baptismal" theology of redemption. Basic biblical texts at this point are Hebrews 2:9 and 14 f.: the Word came "that he might taste death for everyone" and that, having partaken of the same nature as man, "through death, he [Christ] might destroy him who has the power of death, that is, the devil":

And thus taking [Athanasius writes] from our bodies one of like nature, because all were under penalty of the corruption of death, he [Christ] gave it over to death in the stead of all, and offered it to the Father . . . to the end that, firstly, all being held to have died in him through baptism, the law involving the ruin of men might be undone (inasmuch as its power was fully spent in the Lord's body . . .) and that, secondly, whereas men had turned toward corruption, he might turn them again toward incorruption, and quicken them from death by the appropriation of his body [by putting on Christ in baptism] and by the grace of the resurrection.²¹ . . . the Word having become man and having appropriated what pertains to the flesh, . . . he himself is said to have been born, who furnishes to others an origin of being; in order that he may *transfer* our origin into himself, and we may no longer, as mere earth, return to earth, but as being knit into the Word from heaven, may be carried to heaven by him . . . For no longer according to our former origin in Adam do we die; but henceforward our origin and all infirmity of flesh being transferred to the

Word, we rise from the earth, the curse from sin being removed, because of him who is in us [through baptismal rebirth], and who has become a curse for us . . . ; for as we are all from earth and die in Adam, so being reborn from above of *water* and Spirit, in the Christ we are all quickened; the flesh being no longer earthly, but being henceforth made Word . . .²² For he was made man that we might be made gods [immortal].²³

Not to be too long deterred from our examination of Anselm himself, let the foregoing composite quotation from Athanasius stand for the wide range of patristic baptismal theories of the atonement, all of which had this in common, that the primary sacramental means for the appropriation (*idiopoiesis, appropriatio*) of the work of Christ (the putting on of Christ, the dying with Christ, the rebirth in Christ as the second Adam, the incorporation into Christ) was the sacramental ablution, death, and regeneration of baptism. Even the last of the Fathers, John of Damascus, remained clear about the primacy of baptism as the converting and redemptive rite whereby the believer was reborn and incorporated into the redeemed community, the eucharist being the sustaining ordinance.²⁴ Thus as long as baptism remained preëminently an experiential sacrament of adult believers, or at least as long as baptism retained its ancient awesomeness of ritual and richness of theology, as in John of Damascus, and did not have to compete with any elaborate, legalistically codified system of penance (as distinguished from healing and spiritual counsel, which were long characteristic of Eastern "charismatic" penance), the eucharist to which believers gained admittance by redeeming baptism and the historic action on Calvary evoked by the eucharist would continue to be conceived in terms drawn from the experience of baptism.

III. THE EVOLUTION OF SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY AND PRACTICES BY THE END OF THE ELEVENTH CENTURY

As the center of creative theology passed from the Mediterranean to the realm of Charlemagne and his successors, the vividness of the baptismal experiences of ancient Christians paled. Anciently administered only at Easter in connection with the annual celebration of the crucifixion and resurrection (then also at Pentecost and in the East, Epiphany), baptism, partly because of the high rate of infant mortality and the necessarily frequent exceptions to the Easter-Pentecost structure, became gradually disconnected from the liturgical year in its ongoing depression relative to the other sacraments and its dissociation from the eucharist and the sacramental commemoration of the resurrection. The Council of Rouen in 1072, for example, anticipated a development that would become general when it decreed that though adults indeed were to be baptized on the festivals of Easter and Pentecost, infants might be baptized at whatever time their parents desired.²⁵

Hence, as the ritual of baptism came to be simplified and routinized in medieval society, many of its rich redemptive formularies were misunderstood, the ancient mythology forgotten, and the rites conflated and attenuated. For example, as more and more the baptismal liturgy presupposed the renunciation of the devil by the godparents in the name of the baptized infant, the *pompa* of Satan and his demonic entourage lost its older decisiveness. Satan's *pompa* was pluralized.²⁶ The demonic procession had been converted into an assortment of sins, and the attention of theorists of redemption naturally passed from preoccupation with the baptismal renunciation of old gods or demons to the penitential cleansing from sins, and from the patristic interest in the cosmogonic problem of the fallen angels to the predestinarian problem of how God proposed to replace the fallen angels in the heavenly city by those whom he elected from the mass of sinful mankind.²⁷

Another factor in the depression and routinization of baptism and the consequent weakening of the whole cycle of redemptive theory linked with it was the extension of the sacrament of penance and associated disciplines and the elaboration of a penitential theology. The function of the medieval sacrament of penance had, in the primitive Church, been discharged by the sacrament of (adult) baptism. Slowly penance as a subsidiary sacrament developed, at first once-for-all (a second plank of rescue after baptism, and carried out as a rite of public humiliation in the presence of the more steadfast believers), and finally it was made reiterative and private, in the West, under the influence of the Celtic penitential discipline with its detailed tariffs of punishments and redemptions. The process was well on its way to completion by the end of the eleventh century.²⁸ Like the eleventh-century author of the highly influential, systematic *De vera et falsa poenitentia* (long ascribed to Augustine), Anselm believed in reiterative penance (as against the Catharists), in confession to a priest (as against mere private remorse), in the effectiveness of priestly absolution even for the remission of the worst of sins, and also in general absolution of the new type emerging in the eleventh century and culminating in the indulgence granted by the crusading council of Clermont.

Although Anselm could not take for granted the full scholastic systematization of the sacrament of penance with its tripartite *contritio cordis, confessio oris*, and *satisfactio operis*, he used all these technical terms and others, like *poena, meritum, redemptio*, and *satisfactio*;²⁹ and, detaching them from their applicability to the actions of individual men in covering their post-baptismal sins in penitential discipline, he could apply them to the interpretation of the unique redemptive action of the *Deus-homo* in covering the sins of all mankind.

Although much of the language of penance had been coined by Tertullian, *satisfactio* had not been used by him (and only incompletely by Hilary and Ambrose) for the action of Christ himself in the atonement on Calvary.³⁰

Besides the depression of baptism and the elevation of reiterative private penance fresh clarity developed in the eleventh century concerning the sacrament of the eucharist,³¹ for the first time systematically defined in theological debate and conciliar decision—the anti-Berengarian eucharistic controversy. Archbishop Anselm's immediate predecessor in Canterbury, Lanfranc, had been a principal in the formulation of what would be presently called transubstantiation; and Anselm's immediate follower in the new satisfaction theory of the atonement, Honorius of Autun, was one of the most explicit in the widespread definition of the three bodies of Christ as consubstantial with one another, namely, 1) the body born of Mary, offered on the cross, and now enthroned at the right hand of God the Father in glory, 2) the body daily immolated on the Christian altar, and 3) the Church nourished by the Bread on the altar, and yet, says Honorius, "they are not three, but one Body."³² This new clarity of definition of the one Person in three bodies (which might be said to parallel the Chalcedonian clarity in respect to the one Person in two natures) could not but have its effect in any fresh formulation of the manner of man's objective salvation and the means of the believer's subjective appropriation of the work of Christ.³³ It is the eucharist, instead of baptism,³⁴ which is, for many of Anselm's contemporaries, the principal means of redemption, and this is because baptism is now widely felt to possess only the power of Christ, whereas in post-Berengarian metabolism (Geiselman's term) the sacrament of the altar possesses Christ substantially, and hence makes possible a greater degree of participation in redemption in the measure that actual sacramental incorporation into Christ is superior to sacramental rebirth.

Moreover, besides having a clearer definition of the sacrament of the altar, Anselm was able to be confidently precise about the three Persons of the Trinity, and particularly the work and office of the Second, because of his own recent participation in the controversy with nominalist Roscelinus. It is well known, of course, that Anselm tended to be a monothelite, that is, that though he distinguished the two natures, he regarded Christ as having effectually only one will,³⁵ and that he also regarded the incarnate Lord as omniscient (as opposed to the kenotic view).³⁶ It has been suggested that Anselm's Christology³⁷ was closely related to the changing piety and iconography of the late eleventh and twelfth centuries, when the regal figure of the Romanesque crucifix was beginning to show the lineaments of the Gothic Man of sorrows.³⁸

It is thus against the eleventh-century background of a general shift of piety, a new precision as to the sacrament of the altar, a re-statement of the relationship of God the Father to God the Son in terms of philosophical realism over against nominalism, and a theological-institutional clarification of the role of the sacrament of penance which had come to take over some of the significance of ancient baptism that we best explain the changes wrought by Anselm in the Christian's understanding of redemption. It was inevitable that the old complex of soteriological theories growing out of the baptismal experience of redemption from Satan should be recast in language conforming to the enhanced significance of penance and the eucharist. Anselm was the first fully and systematically to articulate this "ecological" shift among the sacraments in terms of the theory of redemption; and, although the older views of redemption persisted in unobserved detachment from the actual sacramental life of the Church, Anselm's theory in modified form was bound to prevail because of its greater consonance with the evolved sacramental system of the medieval Church.

After a millennium in the evolution of the sacramental system a perceptive theologian might well have wished to reformulate for his age a scholastic answer to the question of how man is saved and also from what; for the Pauline Law, patristic Death, and pagan Fate were experientially remote to the devout monk of the eleventh century who had left the Christian world to seek salvation in true philosophy and righteousness in the sacramental life and discipline of a Benedictine monastery.³⁹

IV. THE *Cur Deus Homo* AMONG THE WORKS OF ST. ANSELM

We shall now concentrate on the shifts in sacramental theology as reflected in Anselm himself and seek to explain his *Cur Deus Homo* and related works as the rationalization or rather as a reflection of the altered functions of the sacraments in the life of the Church. Precisely because the *Cur Deus Homo* is programmatically rationalist with allusions to Christian revelation reduced to a minimum, the sacramental and liturgical allusions are even more incidental and scarce; and we must therefore also bring in the related writings of Anselm.

An embryonic formulation of the *Cur Deus Homo* is to be found in the *Disputatio cum Iudaeo* of Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster. This work grew out of a dispute between Crispin and a London Jew. Anselm's formulation is believed to have found its way into the *Disputatio* as a result of Crispin's conversation with Anselm when the Abbot of Bec sojourned between 1092 and 1093 with his friend, who had formerly been a monk under him at Bec.⁴⁰ In this initial formulation of Anselm's theory the *necessitas* (as against Augustine's mere *convenientia*) of God's becoming man is stated emphatically. Unless

God became man to redeem him, man would be owing another than God that which is God's due, and hence there would be no effectual redemption if God had tried to redeem men through, for example, an angel; for men thus redeemed would be loyal not to God but to another. Anselm does not yet break with the ransom owed the devil.⁴¹ Pertinent to our effort to ascertain the sacramental milieu of Anselm's theory is the fact that the Anselmian "Insert" into Crispin's almost exclusively exegetical argumentation between a Christian and a Jew comes at that point where the latter brings up the "Dominus vobiscum" of "vestrarum solemnna missarum" and where the action on Calvary is referred to quite naturally by the Christian as *nostrae restitutionis sacramentum*.⁴²

Another writing of Anselm supplements our understanding of his view of the devotional side of the sacrament of penance. It is the *De monte humilitatis* (a portion of the *Similitudines* once in their entirety ascribed to Anselm.)⁴³ Elsewhere Anselm says little about penance. In the *Cur Deus Homo* itself, for example, Anselm dismisses the serious suggestion of Boso that man may pay God his due in:

repentance; a contrite and humble heart, fastings and all sorts of bodily labors, mercy in giving and forgiving, and obedience . . . Do I not honor God [Boso goes on] when for fear and love of him I abandon temporal delight with contrition of heart; when by fasting and labors I trample on the pleasures and repose of this life; when I freely spend what is mine, giving and forgiving; when I subject myself to him in obedience?⁴⁴

Anselm answers No. But if Anselm finds the works of sacramental penance including repentance insufficient for redemption, it does not mean that he does not highly esteem the sacrament in its limited role. For precisely in *De monte* Anselm converts the twelve rungs of the Benedictine ladder of corporate humility into seven truly progressive steps up the mount of individualistic salvation. Anselm, in distinguishing seven stages of repentance, supplies us with his own personal use of some of the technical language of the sacrament of penance which he will presently apply to the action of the *homo* in the *Deus-homo* on the cross.

In the first grade of humility, for example, which is self-knowledge, Anselm speaks of man as *debitor* of God, both by reason of the original or "natural" sin from birth and that committed thereafter rendering all men most worthy of much *supplicium*. On the second step, which is grief, man desires to merit (*mereri*) the grace (*veniam*) of the Lord and the remittance (*dimittere*) of the offense. By the third step, which is inner confession, and the fourth which is persuasion of guilt, and the fifth which is patient acquiescence in the judgment meted out, the monk is led to the seventh step, which is the complete and loving free satisfaction (*grata satisfactio*) given to God.

Even more personally than in the *De monte*, Anselm expresses

himself with ardor and anguish in his self-flagellant *Oratio II* on his own most grievous sin of unchastity. Herein, incidentally, he refers to the "celestial bath" taken long ago when (as an infant) he was washed, "dowered with the Holy Spirit, and vowed in Christian profession a virgin betrothed to Christ."⁴⁵ Thus the Anselm of *De monte* and *Oratio II* independently of the problem of the atonement has a high and, as it appears, distinctive view of the inner perfections of attrition and contrition, but penance does not achieve, as it did in Tertullian, the mitigation of divine punishment by itself. It provides, rather, as we shall see, the necessary preparation (*cum digno affectu*) for receiving salvation anew after the loss of baptismal purity; and it supplies also the technical terms whereby the action of that representative humanity which is in Christ renews or achieves salvation for the believer in the eucharistic offer of his uncoerced *grata satisfactio* for the sins of the whole world of impuissant *debitores*.

Besides the *De monte*, *Oratio II*, and the Insert in Crispin's *Disputatio*, there are four other *Orationes* throwing light on our theme. All of them were composed in the I-style of personal prayers of the priest which were beginning to find their place in the missal as a result of the spread of private masses. With the multiplication of altars within monasteries and collegiate churches, with the differentiation of the parochial-episcopal eucharist of Christian antiquity into parochial, priestly-private, and votive masses, and the consequent disjunction of the action of the priest and the choir even in the parochial services, and the compiling of complete missals (as distinguished from sacramentaries) so that all the parts of corporate worship might now be taken by the one celebrant in his devotional isolation, it was natural that many private *orationes* should be composed, some of them destined to find a permanent place in the growing missal.⁴⁶

In *Oratio VIII ad sanctum Iohannem Baptistam*,⁴⁷ addressed to John as baptizer of God, Anselm supplies us with the most he ever has to say about baptism and its relation to penance and indirectly to the eucharist. Baptism in infancy washes one clean of the necessary (*necessarii*) sins of conception and birth as distinguished from the voluntary (*spontanei*) sins. It removes the old rags of original sin and puts on the child the garment of innocence, promising still another of incorruption, and restores the divine image.⁴⁸

But the *Oratio* goes on to deplore the loss of this baptismal innocence and bids Christ, through the merits of His own Baptizer, to give by virtue of "the lament of penitence" what He had formerly bestowed in the sacrament of baptism, granting thus to Anselm who is imploring as a penitent what he had once received unknowing as an infant. Thereupon Anselm, with reference to John's witness as *monstrator Dei*, implores Christ:

Tolle qui tollis peccata mundi,
per merita illius qui hoc testimonio te ostendit mundo,
tolle peccata quae contraxi in mundo.⁴⁹

Anselm does not make the connection specific between repentance and the eucharistic taking away of his sins, but the foregoing passage evokes the liturgical and subjective present of the *Agnus Dei* of the mass far more than the historic cry of John the Baptist.

In the *Oratio IV ad sanctum crucem*,⁵⁰ after quoting the introit from the Mass of the Feast of the Holy Cross⁵¹ and referring to the spoliatio of hell by Christ's descent into Hades, Anselm distinguishes two ways in which the work of the cross is made available to the believer, first, in the cleansing water of baptism removing the natural sin in which he had been conceived and born, and then, in the recleansing from the sins committed after baptismal rebirth. The action on the cross wipes out one's sins and mortifies the old life and resurrects one into the new life of justice.⁵² Although Anselm has in mind here baptism, penance, and the sacrament of the altar, it is clear that the eucharist is uppermost in his mind and that "rebirth into the new life of justice" (a phrasing derived from the baptismal passage of Romans 6:3 ff.) is thought of as renewed in the daily eucharist rather than as taking place once-for-all at infant baptism. Moreover, even in his several references to hell Anselm has in mind not so much Christ's harrowing of hell after the crucifixion as the daily *descensus* upon the altar whereby "the demons are terrified, vanquished and crushed," and the penitents in purgatory as well as on earth are eventually redeemed.⁵³

The somewhat later Westminster Missal suggests the same in a number of prayers following the *Agnus Dei* which are not in the present Roman Missal. After the priest prays that he himself might personally merit, through the body and blood of Christ on the altar, that God accept the remission of all his sins, he goes on in another prayer to allude to Christ's descent *ad infima mundi*, as distinguished from *ad inferna (mundi)*. By Christ's continuous descent he enables the priest to officiate at His self-immolation for those also *qui in locis purgatoriis sunt* and are consequently, apart from the altar, unable to make the oblation themselves except as the *ecclesia militans* is sacramentally linked with the *ecclesia patiens* of purgatory. It is surely an indication of a tremendous shift in the idea of redemption that whereas in Christian antiquity Christ descended once-for-all into hell between the crucifixion and the resurrection and delivered the righteous dead of the Old Covenant from the shades either by preaching or by forcing the gates of hell in harrowing it, he now reiterates his descent as he also repeats his immolation on the cross and, in continuously descending *ad infima mundi*, reduces and mitigates by his action on

the altar the pains of purgatory through the personal communion on the part of the officiating priest of the votive mass.⁵⁴

Anselm's stress on eucharistic redemption comes out most prominently in another prayer, *Oratio III ad accipiendum corpus Domini et sanguinem*.⁵⁵ In this beautiful and brief prayer, Anselm uses the key passage for Paul's theology of baptism (Romans 6:3ff.)⁵⁶ as a dying, a being buried, and a resurrection with Christ from the dead into a new life to describe the effect, not of baptismal regeneration, but of eucharistic incorporation "through mouth and heart, through faith and feeling" (*ore et corde atque fide et affectu*).⁵⁷ In his phrasing Anselm is also alluding to Romans 10:10 (itself an echo of Deuteronomy 30:14) where Paul writes of open confession with the mouth and inner belief in the heart that God has raised Christ from the dead, and is thus imperceptibly converting Paul's oral confession of faith into an oral consumption in faith of the resurrection body unto salvation. Significantly Anselm goes on to pray, not as an officiating priest for all the faithful corporately, but for himself as an individual communicant, that he might be worthy of being planted together (*complantari*) in the likeness of Christ's death and resurrection by the mortification of the old man and the newness of a just life. Thus Anselm, from a Pauline passage (Romans 10:10) expressive of an individualistic non-sacramental confession of faith which is now applied sacramentally, passes over to the use of another Pauline passage (Romans 6:5) expressive of a corporate-sacramental⁵⁸ view of salvation, which is now applied individualistically; and in this exchange the Pauline theology of baptismal salvation is robbed of its *crucial* text to enhance the Anselmian theory of eucharistic redemption.

Anselm goes on to say that Christ's body into which he is eucharistically incorporated is on the altar and is the Church itself; and, alluding to the eucharistic passage of John 6:57, he prays that he might remain in Christ and Christ in him until his "body of lowliness" be conformed to "the body of glory." Thus Anselm, in alluding to Philippians 3:21, finds in the eucharistic nutriment the means of a gradual transformation of the believer's temporal body into the *eschatological* body.

More significant, perhaps, than even this liturgical anticipation of the glorified body is Anselm's conversion of the corporate imagery of both the baptismal and the eschatological passages from Paul (Romans 6:5 and Philippians 3:21) into the language of individualistic assimilation into the eucharistic body, one with that born of Mary, crucified on Calvary, and enthroned at the right hand of the Father in glory. The crucified Body is, of course, the humanity of the *Deus-homo*, for the deity cannot suffer.

The sense of experiential, personal incorporation is all the more

remarkable for the reason that as priestly communicant Anselm would ordinarily be expected to be mindful of the whole body of the faithful, past, present, and future, rather than to be preoccupied with his own incorporation by means of the mass into them and into the glorified Body. Yet Anselm in this, as in so many of his utterances, is here reflecting the general shift in eucharistic piety in the monasteries and minsters. After alluding to a phrase in the Communion Prayer,⁵⁹ he transmutes, or supplies us with a variation of, another formulary of the missal. This is the *Non sum dignus* of the God-fearing centurion of Capernaum (Matthew 8:8), a prayer that was beginning to enter the missal by the end of the tenth century.⁶⁰ But, instead of dwelling on his not being worthy that Christ should enter under his roof (*tectum*),⁶¹ Anselm prays that he may indeed be worthy of incorporation. Since the usage spreading in the eleventh century of the Capernaite passage in a eucharistic sense suggests a general feeling of awesome unworthiness as though even priests were but God-fearing centurions on the fringe of Christian Israel, Anselm's alteration is all the more instructive.

Still another prayer illuminates for us Anselm's feeling as to the relationship of redemption to the sacramental and devotional life. It is his *Oratio VII ad sanctam Mariam*.⁶² Anselm, incidentally, occupies a place of some importance in the evolution of Marian doctrine.⁶³ The second Eve of patristic and scholastic theology was at once the Church and Mary the Mother of the Second Adam; the Church itself was at once the Body of Christ and the Mother which daily bears that Body on the altar. Having in effect summed up the developments of the preceding three centuries, Anselm greatly influenced the Mariology of the later Middle Ages. The first technical use of *mediatrix* in the West was traditionally ascribed to him.⁶⁴ Clearly Anselm's conception of the role of Mary in redemption and in the dispensing of sacramental grace is germane to our theme. And it need scarcely be mentioned that her role in a penitential-eucharistic theory of redemption is naturally greater than in a baptismal theory, for she was remote from the baptism of Christ at the Jordan but prominent at the crucifixion; and earlier, at the marriage of Cana, interpreted eucharistically, it was Mary who instigated the miracle of transubstantiation,

In *Oratio VII* Anselm addresses Mary as the Mother of the "restitution" as God is the Father of creation,⁶⁵ also as the Mother by whom believers are made brothers of the Saviour and Judge;⁶⁶ and the praying saint seeks through Mary's merits⁶⁷ to obtain that sufficient love both for her and for Christ which he owes (*debet*). In the prayer, Anselm alludes to the necessity of replacing the angels of the half-ruined heavenly city,⁶⁸ to his loss of that purity which was momentarily his through the regeneration of baptism,⁶⁹ to penance

(or at least repentance),⁷⁰ and finally, by implication, to the eucharist; for Anselm appeals to both Christ and Mary to grant him that which he owes *them*, in order that *they* may receive their *debitum*.

Before taking up the *Cur Deus Homo* itself and two other Anselmian writings on exactly the same theme, we should mention one treatise which was composed afterwards and which at several points refers to *Cur Deus Homo*.

It is the *De conceptu virginali et de originali peccato*.⁷¹ Herein Anselm makes more explicit than in the *Cur Deus Homo* that *from* which the atonement saves men: namely, from original sin and from actual sins. Baptismal atonement, in contrast, saves men from death and demons. The distinction is important and it marks a departure even from Augustine in the direction of mitigation and reconception of the character⁷² of original sin. In brief, Anselm insists that Adam's sin centered not in the specialized defection of the will called concupiscence, but in general defection of the will in which envy was operative. It is not primarily the turmoil of the affections which Anselm stresses.⁷³ Nor was the fall, for Anselm, a loss of the pristine pure reason. The fall was a defection not of the senses, not of the mind, but rather of the rational will, a wilful turning from the original uprightness of willing one thing. Original sin is thus a privation of original righteousness. Anselm calls it the *iustitiae debitae nuditas*,⁷⁴ thereby altering the concupiscent image of nudity into one compatible with his voluntarist view of sin as a defection of the rational will. Thus he is able largely to free himself from the idea that original sin is propagated by conjugal concupiscence and to locate man's sinfulness in his essential being rather than in the manner of his non-angelic propagation.⁷⁵

Original righteousness (*justitia*) consisted in giving the Creator his due "honor" in utter obedience. Fallen man is characterized by the guilt (*culpa*) of having lapsed, and also by the continuing obligation of possessing justice unimpaired. The obligation of making satisfaction for his dereliction of duty is his *debitum*, the unfulfilled oughtness in his nature. Besides this clarification⁷⁶ of the state of fallen man, Anselm is very clear and fresh in his interpretation of the relationship between generic human nature and the individual in respect to sinfulness. He prefers to call original sin "natural" sin, that is, a liability⁷⁶ of human nature as represented and hence corrupted in the original defection of Adam. Anselm is not disposed to augment this sinfulness by including in it the accumulated sins of one's ancestors subsequent to Adam himself⁷⁷ (although for the purposes of demonstrating Christ's sinless nature he argues in terms of this more comprehensive view).⁷⁸ Nevertheless, apart from holding each individual responsible for the fall of Adam, since each was genetically present, Anselm sets over

against "natural" sin the actual sin of individuals which he calls "personal" sin.⁷⁹

Now these two kinds of sin, natural and personal, had to be compensated for by the universal satisfaction of the *Deus-homo* who representatively gave God the due honor of utmost obedience, going beyond what was necessary,⁸⁰ since he was blameless in respect both to natural and to personal sin, and therefore made available a more than adequate restitution in which all human nature generally and all believers individually might participate.

The effect of the original offering of obedience does not become available automatically. All men are related to the primal man by the genetic universalism of propagation; but they are not brought into relation with the second Adam except by baptismal rebirth or eucharistic incorporation into the Body of Christ. In Christian antiquity, as we have seen, baptism was the incorporative sacrament; but for a small group, to which Anselm seems to have belonged, the sacrament of perfect incorporation into the Second universal Man was the eucharist.⁸¹ In *De originali peccato*, Anselm thinks of baptism as removing "natural" sin or rather the *culpa* for the impotence of not having righteousness in a natural state. Baptism on this view is indispensable for removing the *culpa* of *impotentia* and the absence of due righteousness as a consequence of "natural" sin (*absentia debita iustitiae*),⁸² but baptism does not actually incorporate the child (or adult believer) into the sinless universal humanity represented by Christ. Although Anselm does not formally state the difference between the function of baptism and eucharist in the contrasting terms of *ablution* and *incorporation*, it is clear that he belongs to that tradition in the history of the theory of the sacramental appropriation of the work of Christ which makes baptism secondary and the eucharist primary in the mystical-sacramental process of incorporation.

We are now prepared to turn to Anselm's principal writings which deal directly with the atonement. Precisely because the *Cur Deus Homo* is abstract on principle, we are indeed fortunate to have two other works besides, one having the same title and the other dealing with the same topic, whereby we may fill out the meagre evidence of the *Cur Deus Homo* itself.

The first of these has been edited as the *Libellus Cur Deus Homo* and ascribed by Eugene Druwé⁸³ to Anselm as the first draft of the familiar *Cur Deus Homo*. Jean Riviére, the magisterial historian of the medieval development of the theory of the atonement,⁸⁴ and F. S. Schmitt, the editor of *Opera omnia*,⁸⁵ have both vigorously contested Druwé's claim for an Anselmian authorship of the *Libellus*. But since Schmitt himself connects it very closely with Anselm, we may use its sacramental and liturgical references judiciously. We know that

Anselm presented his view of the atonement before the assembled monks of St. Omer, November 11, 1097.⁸⁶ In any event, we are close enough to Anselm the priest and monk in this *Libellus* to use it to supplement what Anselm the scholastic has to say about why God became man and more particularly how the far-away objective action of the God-man is to be subjectively appropriated by each generation of believers.

The second supplementary "*Cur Deus homo*" is entitled *Meditatio III redemptionis humanae*.⁸⁷ Like the *Libellus*, it supplies more sacramental and liturgical allusions than the starkly rationalist demonstration of the *Cur Deus Homo*. *Meditatio III* furnishes, in fact, the fullest indication of the relationship between the act of atonement on Calvary and the sacramental system.

In it Anselm movingly describes the leaden weight of sin dragging everyone down the slippery slopes into the abyss of infernal chaos. Then he describes how Christ as the sun of righteousness shone upon him personally,⁸⁸ illuminating his predicament even before he was, presumably as an infant, aware of it; for in his primal parents he had descended from righteousness to unrighteousness, whereby the descent is made into hell:⁸⁹

For even when as yet I was not able to know of it, thou didst teach others all these things, who were there in my behalf [at baptism] and afterward me myself before I ever sought it. Thou hast thrown off the dragging lead, the pressing burden, and the inciting foes, for thou hast moved away the sin in which I was born and conceived and the condemnation and hast warded off the hostile spirits lest they do violence to my soul. Thou hast caused me to be called a Christian after thy name whereby both I confess thee and thou ownest me among thy redeemed . . .⁹⁰

At a point previous to this Anselm described the baptismal action in the words placed in the mouth of Jesus Christ speaking through the priest at baptism:

Take courage, I have redeemed thee; I have given my soul for thee. If thou cleavest to me, thou *shalt* escape the miseries in which thou wast, and shalt not fall into the deep whither thou wast hastening; but I *will* lead thee to my Kingdom and *will* make thee an heir of God and a joint-heir with me.⁹¹

It is significant that in Romans 8:17, upon which the foregoing sentence is based, Paul had thought of the redemptive action of Christ as having *already* made believers co-heirs with him rather than placing this relationship, as here in Anselm, in the future.

It will be observed that baptism is here thought of as removing the *onus* of "natural" sin and the condemnation for it; but liberation from "personal" sin is largely the work of the eucharist and the preparation therefor, namely, penance.⁹² In fact, their action is mentioned before that of baptism in the *Meditatio*:

Thus that Man redeemed all others, inasmuch as that which he of his own free will gave to God he computes as covering the *debitum* which they owed (*debebant*) to him. By this price man is not only and merely *once* redeemed from his faults (*culpīs*) but also *however often* he returns *cum digna paenitentia* he is accepted, a *paenitentia*, however, which is not promised to anyone actually sinning. Because of what was done upon the cross, it is by the cross that Christ has redeemed us. Those therefore, who wish to approach (*accedere*) this grace *cum digno affectu* are saved, while those who despise it, since they do not *re-give* (*reddunt*) the *debitum* which they individually owe (*debent*), are justly damned.⁹³

Here follows very vivid eucharistic language about feeding on the eucharistic bread to be quoted presently.

We are now ready for the *Cur Deus Homo* itself. It has only two identifiable liturgical allusions, mentions penance at only one place,⁹⁴ and does not use the term baptism or eucharist at all. But at two points Anselm supplies parables which cast light upon our problem, the parable of the dirty pearl, (I, 19), which has a parallel in the *Libellus*, and the parable of the magnanimous king (II, 16).

In the parable of the pearl, Anselm pictures God in paradise as a rich man holding in his hand a precious pearl, human nature in its pristine perfection. He decides "to store it in his treasury, heaven, where he keeps his dearest and most precious possessions," namely, the angels. The devil, himself fallen from heaven because of wilfulness⁹⁵ and pictured as a person inflamed by envy, knocks the pearl into the mud of sin. To be sure, God could have prevented this in his omnipotence, but the point of the parable is not God's, at this point unexplained, equanimity and acquiescence in the face of demonic insult but rather his concern to recover the pearl, to cleanse it, and to place it in his treasure box. The washing (*lavatio*) of the pearl is significantly called *satisfactio*. The image of washing would by itself suggest baptism, but *satisfactio* surely suggests penance rather than baptism. Moreover, the immediate sequel, with its mention of the Dominical prayer prominent in the mass, suggests a penitential *lavatio* of personal sins and a "eucharistic" *satisfactio* of the Deity rather than a baptismal renunciation of the devil.

In the second parable in *Cur Deus Homo*, Anselm is helpfully specific in alluding to the sacraments. This parable about a king and one Innocent Citizen in an unruly city may be instructively compared with Athanasius' famous incarnational parable⁹⁶ of the King Himself (Christ) resident in the Satan-besieged city of man:

... suppose [Anselm says] that there is a king, and that the whole population of one of his cities—with the sole exception of one man, who nonetheless belongs to their race — has sinned against him, so that none of them can manage to escape condemnation to death. But suppose too that the one innocent man is in such favor with the king that he is able — and so kindly disposed toward the guilty that he is willing — to reconcile all who believe in his plan (*consilio*) by some service (*quodam ser-*

vitio) sure to please the king greatly, which he will perform on a day set by the king's decision. And since all who need to be reconciled cannot meet on that day, the king grants absolution [baptism/penance] from every past fault (*ab omni culpa... absoluti praeterita*), because of the greatness of that service (*illius servitii*), to everyone who either before⁹⁷ or after that day confesses his readiness to seek pardon through the deed (*opus*) done that day, and to ratify (*accedere*) the covenant (*pactum*) then made. And if they happened to sin again after this pardon, he is ready to grant them pardon (*veniam*) again [penance/eucharist] because of the efficacy of this covenant (*pacti*), if they are willing worthily to make satisfaction (*digne satisfacere*) and then to be chastized (*corrigi*). No one, however, is to enter his palace [the Kingdom of God] until that is done [baptism and penance/eucharist] whereby the faults (*culpa*e) are remitted (*relaxantur*).⁹⁸

In the parable Anselm goes on to declare that there were not enough believers or citizens of the unruly city to take advantage of the covenant to enable the depopulated heavenly city to be replenished and that hence the benefits of the pact were made available to others not contemporaneous with the Innocent Citizen's magnanimous action. Although, in this second parable, Anselm glides over the question that interests us, namely, how contemporaries of Jesus ratified the covenant "sacramentally," entry into the palace in this parable is the same as deposit in the heavenly treasure-chest of the first parable; and it is therefore apparent from both that the principal sacramental action whereby one enters the Kingdom is through penance and the eucharist, that it is by means of the eucharist that the believer becomes progressively part of the heavenly Body (the Church triumphant).

This interpretation is borne out by several other scraps of evidence and allusions. The very chapter in which the second parable appears contains one of the two clear echoes in *Cur Deus Homo* of the language of the mass. When Anselm, in substantiation of his basic and characteristic emphasis that man redeemed is superior to paradisiac man as first created, writes: "... God has restored human nature even more wonderfully than he created it,"⁹⁹ he is echoing the offertory of the missal: "O God, who didst wonderfully create and yet more wonderfully renew the dignity of human nature (*humanae substantiae dignitatem*)."¹⁰⁰ Moreover, in this same chapter, he describes how Christ's sinless and hence redemptive human nature is different from generic human nature in the eucharistic simile of unleavened bread taken from the sinfully leavened lump of ordinary humanity (*azymum de fermento*).¹⁰⁰

It is clear that the older baptismal experience of dying and rising with Christ has been emotionally displaced by the eucharistic experience of consuming the crucified body of Christ and absorbing each day more of that celestial body in a process of devout consumption and imitation of Christ which is to be completed only when He himself

comes in glory. Anselm speaks of the action on Calvary itself as the "sacrament of our redemption" or "restitution."¹⁰¹

It is primarily through approaching the sacrament of the altar with the feeling of honor owed to God and the sense of utter inadequacy to discharge the obligation (*debito affectu*),¹⁰² *cum digno affectu*,¹⁰³ *cum digna paenitentia*,¹⁰⁴ *admiratione et reverentia*,¹⁰⁵ that one merits participating in the merit of Christ's renewed act of universalized obedience, sacrifice, and *satisfactio*. To appropriate the benefits of Christ's work the believer becomes one with Christ's universal *humana substantia* by behavior and sacramental action appropriate to this end.

Anselm makes clear in his *Epistola de incarnatione Verbi* that the humanity or *humana substantia* of Christ is a "universal" in the language of a later scholasticism, that the *homo* of the *Deus-homo* is "another nature, not another person,"¹⁰⁶ a passible universal substance redemptively assumed by One Person of the universal triune *deitas* as the means of effecting that suitable sacrifice of utter obedience which all three Persons as God can accept. By virtue of the clarification brought about by his direct involvement in answering the challenge of Roscelinus, Anselm is able to say that the universal humanity in Christ paid the *debita justitia* to the deity (in three Persons) or, in the traditional language of liturgical piety, that the Son paid due honor to the father,¹⁰⁷ and that each believer by penitential-eucharistic incorporation into the universal Man of sorrows daily pays the worship due to God. In other words, the *meritum* of Christ's death on Calvary can be repeatedly and individually returned by the believer in the divine office which is at once the reënactment of the action on Calvary and the individual participant's payment of due honor to God in worship through daily incorporation in the self-sacrificing *corpus* of the altar.

Whereas in the ancient church, especially in the East saturated with the theology of the mystery religions, one had sought to become participant in the *divinity*¹⁰⁸ of Christ and thereby to recover immortal life lost in the fall from paradise, or to recover the divine image in the pure *gnosis* forfeited by the presumptuous grasp for the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, Anselm seems to be thinking primarily of participating sacramentally in the sinless *humanity* of the God-man in order to recover the pristine justice of human nature corrupted by Adam's wilfulness, and especially to wipe out all personal sins contracted for after baptismal regeneration.

Hence, in Anselm's theology, imitation of the obedient Christ even before his death is not neglected, while his death itself is taken as the climax of a life of utter obedience, willing one thing:

... he, who was to redeem men and to lead them back by his teaching from the way of death and ruin to the way of life and blessedness, moved among men¹⁰⁹ and, in that very association, presented himself as an

example, while by word he taught them how to live. But how could he give himself as an example to the weak and mortal, to teach them not to draw back from *justice* on account of injuries or insults or sufferings or death, if they did not recognize that he himself felt all these things?¹¹⁰

We do not usually think of the *Cur Deus Homo* as making anything of the action of the *Deus-homo* before the death on the cross.

To be sure, the concept of *imitatio Christi* appears more characteristically in connection with Christ's death. In the already cited *Meditatio III*, Anselm connects the *imitatio* with the eucharistic *debitum*, saying that while he as believer ought (*debeo*) "to execrate the cruelty of those who caused thy pains," he ought also "by compassionating (*compatiendo*) [Christ] imitate thy death and toils."¹¹¹ In the *Cur Deus Homo* Anselm says that it is in the sacrament of redemption that believers become preëminently *imitatores* of Christ and consequently participants in the merit of the death of his sinless humanity on the altar,¹¹² for through identification with that sinless body in its sacramental reënactment of the death on the cross, "man conquers the devil,"¹¹³ as is proper, since God owes nothing to the devil, and owes all to God. The specific action of *full* appropriation and identification takes place not when the believer, coming from unbelief to faith, believes and is baptized, but rather when, having come from infant baptismal ablution of the generic *culpa* of not having justice in his essential human nature, and then coming more directly from penance with due affection, having joyfully accepted the *poena*, the penitent believer responds in the mass (to which he has been readmitted by penance) to God in the liturgical action of the priest, when God, in effect, says: "Accept (*accipe*) my only begotten Son and give him for thyself," as the believer's part in the *debita iustitia* of man in general and his own personal *debita* in particular, and hears the son himself say: "Take (*tolle*) me and redeem thyself."¹¹⁴ It is no chance that key words of this passage reflect the phrasing of the canon of the mass, "panem coelestem (or calicem salutaris) *accipiam*," "*dimitte nobis debita nostra*," "Agnus Dei, qui *tollis* peccata mundi." The sense of the divine presence on the altar had become especially tangible in the time of Anselm. The Host was commonly addressed in prayer, held in the devout hands of the priest.¹¹⁵ The later Westminster Missal, for example, has the following prayer after the *Agnus Dei*, directed to the *Corpus Christi*:

Adoramus sanctum corpus tuum atque sanctum sanguinem tuum domine ihesus christe cuius effusione omnes redempti sumus . . .¹¹⁶

In *Meditatio III* the recurrent theme is likewise eucharistic salvation in tasting the Lord for he is good, feeding upon him in one's heart by faith. Such language along with the bridal imagery¹¹⁷ is common to the later mystics apart from the sacramental experience of the altar, but in the eleventh century it is not yet detached from the

sacramental life of the monastery and minster. In the mood of piety and devotion in the *Meditatio*, as distinguished from the rational rigor of the *Cur Deus Homo*, it is clear that Anselm is thinking of penance and the eucharist rather than baptism as the effectual means of appropriating the work of Christ and of becoming identified with his sinless humanity in its redeeming role. *Meditatio III* opens thus:

Christian soul, soul raised from somber death, soul redeemed from miserable slavery and set free by the blood of God: arouse thy mind, be mindful of thy resuscitation, ponder thy redemption and liberation. Consider where the power (*virtus*) of thy salvation is and what it is Taste the goodness of thy Redeemer, be inflamed with the love of thy Saviour. Bite the honeycomb of the words, suck the savor better than honey, swallow the saving sweetness. Chew by thinking, suck in knowing, swallow in loving and rejoicing. Gladden thyself by chewing, exult in sucking, be joyful in swallowing.

Where and what is the power and strength of thy salvation? Surely Christ has resuscitated thee. He, the good Samaritan, has healed thee; he, the good friend, has redeemed thee with his soul and set thee free.¹¹⁸

Anselm goes on to describe the cross. By themselves the foregoing words cannot be made to apply unequivocally to the communion, but when much the same language is repeated later on in the *Meditatio*, the impression is confirmed that Anselm thinks of the eucharist as the principal means of incorporation into the sinless and potentially universal humanity of the *Deus-homo*, in the merit of the eucharistic repetition of the action on Calvary.¹¹⁹ After describing Christ's *meritum* of utter obedience in taking the chalice of obedience which the Father gave him, Anselm goes on:

This let thy heart chew, O man, this let it ruminate, this let it suck, this let it swallow when thy mouth receives (*accipit*) the Body and Blood of the selfsame, thy Redeemer. Make this in this present life thy daily bread, thy viand and viaticum, for by means of this and by nothing except this shalt thou at once remain in Christ and Christ in thee¹²⁰

The last phrase is especially significant, for it echoes the eucharistic passage of John 6:57 and its "enthusiast" parallel I John 4:15 f. about the indwelling of the Son of God in the believer.

In the *Libellus* Anselm's follower in St. Omer presses even closer toward an articulation of his theory of atonement in terms of the sacramental life. He vividly pictures the historic Calvary. The *pius* and *bonus genitor* is above, the *pia* and *bona genetrix* below, and their Son between, bearing the nature of each in his person on the cross: "Not sweeter was the emotion of the Son offering than the ready will of the Father receiving."¹²¹ Then, turning to the present and by implication to the reenactment of the work of Calvary on the altar, he writes:

Whosoever in truth have faith in his death, whosoever look up full of faith to his death, are healed from the bites of the devil and from the poison of sin and step (*gradiuntur*) into the land of promise.¹²²

And then, like Anselm himself in his eucharistic *Oratio III*, the compiler mingles the imagery of baptism and the eucharist and, alluding to the bleeding side, to the purple (*rubrum*) vestment (John 19:5), to the chalice of suffering, he speaks of the sacred blood as washing, cleansing, and purging him, again quite individualistically, and making him, owing much and having nothing, the heir of Christ and the beneficiary of the merit of the action of His sinless humanity.

We have seen that Anselm belongs to the group who responded theologically to the attenuation of baptism and the accentuation of the eucharist. Baptism, from having been the unique sacrament of incorporation in the body of Christ in the ancient Church, was in Anselm demoted to serving as the ablutionary preparation therefor, or at best was regarded as a contingent *incorporatio imperfecta* to be followed by eucharistic *incorporatio perfecta*.¹²³

Honorius of Autun, who is one of the few immediate followers of Anselm in the satisfaction theory of the atonement,¹²⁴ was quite specific about the incorporative eucharist when he said:

For this reason water is mixed with wine that the people redeemed by the blood of Christ are *washed* by the water of baptism; by the *pastum* of this food and the *potum* of this wine they are brought into communion (*communicatur*) with Christ.¹²⁵

and that:

In baptism we are buried with Christ . . . by the food indeed of his body we are incorporated into him,¹²⁶

and that:

. . . by faith we are con-crucified with Christ to the world, to vices, and concupiscences, and in baptism we are buried with Christ and therefore thrice immersed, by the food (*cibum*) indeed of his body we are incorporated in him.¹²⁷

Honorius elsewhere suggests that it has been appropriate in the justice of God "that he who, by a food (*cibum*) destroying life, was held bound to death, should be restored by a food conquering death."¹²⁸

V. CONCLUSION

Anselm's theory of the atonement, when seen in the isolation of its rationalistic formulation in the *Cur Deus Homo*, seems so to have abstracted the action of redemption from history and from the ongoing life of the Church that it appears like a vast and remote cosmic computation whereby the merit of a certain innocent man's death is multiplied by the infinity of his divinity to yield up more than enough honor to make good on the first man's failure to obey God.

But our analysis of the liturgical and sacramental allusions in *Cur Deus Homo* in connection with the allied material makes it clear that Anselm's theory of the atonement is especially meaningful in the penitential-eucharistic context of a progressive incorporation into the universal humanity represented on the altar in a process which extends Christ's far-away and long-ago action into each day's struggle

with wilfulness and each day's acceptance of the heavenly manna, a sacramental process whereby "the body of lowliness" is gradually transformed into "the body of glory," prepared to find its place among the angelic host.¹²⁹ Precisely because Anselm does not regard penance as adequate *satisfactio* or sufficient *poena* (as it had been for Tertullian), the *satisfactio* of the God-man is not for Anselm, as he transposes the technical language of penance to the objective atonement of Calvary, a "vicarious penance" but rather a vicarious oblation of utter obedience whereby the second universal Man obeys God in the drinking of the chalice and dying on the cross,¹³⁰ and thus restores the original justice due to God. For, whereas the first universal man had deprived God of his due honor by the disobedience of eating of the forbidden tree and had consequently forfeited immortality, the second Adam who was from heaven, eternal, was obedient in drinking of the proffered chalice of the cross. In the subjective appropriation of redemption in Anselm's penitential-eucharistic theory, all men may participate in the action of the one Man, not preëminently through the sacramental death of baptism (as in Athanasius, for example),¹³¹ but through the sacramental obedience of the eucharist.

Anselm has no trace of the deificatory theory in his writings. He breaks completely with the patristic view and apparently construes the formulary of the missal, *divinitatis consortes*, only in the undifferentiated sense of reciprocal mystical union with Christ as at once fully God and fully man and with his body which is the Church; for when Anselm is specific, he anticipates the sober and lapidary formulary of the IV Lateran Council:

ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro.¹³²

And this is because Anselm was the first fully to think his way through the new sacramental system of the Church and its soteriological significance and wrote his *Cur Deus Homo* in the terms of philosophical realism, experientially convinced that it is through the eucharist that the *penitent* believer is ever anew reincorporated through the *oblatio* into the universal *humanity* of the Redeemer present under the accidents of bread and wine on the altar. God long ago became man and in Christ established the eucharist that men everywhere and at all times might daily join sacramentally in the *oblatio* of due honor (*debitum honorem*)¹³³ which is the mass, and thus through the universalized satisfaction of the self-immolating universal Body of the second Adam pay daily the "natural" *debitum* of the first man and especially their "personal" *debita*,¹³⁴ and in this way progressively prepare by daily purification and eucharistic nourishment for citizenship in the Angelic City, there to be sustained forever by the *Panis Angelicus*.

1. Five volumes, Rome, Edinburgh, etc., 1950-1955. All references in this paper are to this edition of Anselm's works. Schmitt began his critical work in another series, *Florilegium Patristicum*. The most recent translation of the *Cur Deus Homo* and other works by Anselm is by Eugene Fairweather, *A Scholastic Miscellany*, Library of Christian Classics, X (Philadelphia, 1956).
2. A comparison between the formularies of the eucharistic and the baptismal rites in the present Roman Missal shows clearly how the Anselmian view of redemption is connected with the eucharist and might seem to some to make the following effort a pushing at open doors. It will be borne in mind, however that the present missal embodies changes in emphasis that were first beginning to be felt in the eleventh century.
3. D. H. Cremer, "Die Wurzeln des Anselmischen Satisfaktionsbegriffs," *Studien und Kritiken*, III (1880), pp. 7-21; "Der germanische Satisfaktionsbegriff in der Versöhnungslehre," *ibid.*, vol. XVI (1893), pp. 316-345.
4. F. Loofs, *Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed. (Halle, 1906), p. 511: "Anselm's theory is an evaluation of the work of Christ by means of the conceptual material of the doctrine of penance;" similarly, A. von Harnack, *History of Dogma*, VI, pp. 56 ff.
5. G. van der Plaas, "Des hl. Anselm 'Cur Deus Homo' auf dem Boden der jüdisch-christlichen Polemik des Mittelalters," *Divus Thomas*, VII (1929), p. 446.
6. Gustaf Aulén, *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of Three Main Types of the Idea of Atonement* (1930), transl. from the Swedish by A. G. Hebert (London, 1931).
7. P. Chenu, "Cur Homo? Le sous-sol d'une controverse au XII^e siècle," *Mélanges de science religieuse*, X (Lille, 1953), pp. 195-204.
8. C. W. Mönnich, "De inhoud van Anselmus' *Cur Deus Homo*," *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis*, XXXVI (1948-1949), pp. 77-108.
9. R. W. Southern, *The Making of the Middle Ages* (New Haven, 1953), pp. 222-240; 250-255.
10. John McIntyre, *St. Anselm and His Critics: A Re-interpretation of the Cur Deus Homo* (Edinburgh, 1954).
Indispensable and basic for all comparative studies is Jean Rivière, *Le dogme de la rédemption au début du moyen âge* (Paris, 1934). An earlier work with a fuller treatment of Anselm is *Le dogme de la rédemption* (Paris, 1905). Among the older works mention should be made of Robert S. Franks, *A History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ in its Ecclesiastical Development*, I (London, 1918), which admirably evaluates the work of Cremer, Loofs, Gottschick, Harnack, and Schultz on the *Cur Deus Homo* and advances special views of its own. Franks saw more clearly than most historians of the more catholic traditions the importance of linking changing theories of redemption with the doctrine of grace and the evolution of the sacramental theology of the Church. Franks brought his views up to date in a succinct systematic treatment, *The Atonement* (Oxford, 1934).
11. An aspect of the tension has been most recently traced by Ernest Kantorowicz, "The Baptism of the Apostles," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, nos. 9 and 10 (Cambridge, 1956).
12. Martin Werner, among others, has pointed to the eschatological character of the Pauline baptismal theory of cosmic redemption and to the reworking of it in purely anthropological terms in connection with the shift in baptismal theology. *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Bern, 1941), "Von der Erlösung und ihrer sakramentalen Vermittlung," pp. 389 ff.
13. *Ep. LXIX, cap. 15*.
14. In the course of patristic reflection several interrelated "baptismal" theories of salvation emerged, all of them, of course, resting on biblical texts but growing out of diverse preoccupations and experiences of ancient Christians, namely: redemption as purification from sin, as reconciliation with God through Christ's fulfilment of the law, as initiation into membership in the chosen race, as advance participation in the Kingdom of Christ, as dying to the world and proleptic resurrection in and with Christ, as restoration of the divine image of paradisiac man, as illumination, as deification, as joining *Christus victor* in the cosmological combat with Satan, as redemption from the devil, and as eternal election. These diverse conceptions have recently been grouped under four main types by H. E. W. Turner, *The Patristic Doctrine of Redemption: A Study of the Development of Doctrine during the First Five Centuries* (London, 1952). The pre-eminence of one of these themes in the New Testament has been most recently worked through by Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament* (New York, 1954). All of these emphases in the ancient conception of Christian salvation, not by any means mutually exclusive, were grounded in or presupposed the initiatory, cleansing, and redeeming rite of baptismal regeneration.
15. *Work of Christ*, I, p. 98.
16. Hugo Rahner, "Pompa diaboli," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LV (1931), p. 252.

17. Erik Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln . . . im Kultus*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1955), pp. 46f.
18. Per Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne Eglise*, Acta Seminarii neotestamentici Upsalensis, X (Leipzig/Upsala, 1942); Harry A. Eehle, *The Terminology of the Sacrament of Regeneration according to Clement of Alexandria*, The Catholic University of America, Theological Studies, 2nd ser., XXX (Washington, 1949); Thomas L. Campbell, *Notes and Commentary on Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite's Chapter on the Mystery of Illumination*, same series, LXXXIII (Washington, 1955) with the new literature.
19. See J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London, 1950), p. 378: "... about the time when the Descent was beginning to appear in creeds, the ancient notion of Christ's mission to the patriarchs was fading more and more into the background, and the doctrine was coming to be interpreted as symbolizing His triumph over Satan and death, and, consequently, the salvation of mankind as a whole" (p. 382). On the history of the *descensus*, see Joseph Turmel, *La Descente du Christ aux enfers* (Paris, 1905); J. A. MacCulloch, *The Harrowing of Hell* (Edinburgh, 1930); Werner Bieder, *Die Vorstellung von der Höllenfahrt Jesu Christi*, Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Nr. 19 (Zürich, 1949). A. H. S. Lindroth has specifically related "the classical theory of redemption" (Aulen) and the Descent into Hades, "*Descendit ad inferna*," *Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift*, VIII (Upsala, 1932), pp. 121-140.
20. For a most recent study of the patristic imagery of the baptismal font as tomb and womb, see Walter M. Bedard, *The Symbolism of the Baptismal Font in Early Christian Thought*, The Catholic University of America, Studies in Sacred Theology, 2nd ser. XLV (Washington, 1951).
21. *De incarnatione*, 8, 4.
22. *Oratio* III, 33.
23. *De incarnatione*, 54, 3.
24. *De fide Orthodoxa*, iv, 9 and 13.
25. Rupert, Abbot Deutz (d. 1129), gives evidence for widespread dissociation in his time of infant baptism from the liturgical year. See Walter J. Conway, *The Time and Place of Baptism*, Catholic University of America, Canon Law Studies, no. 324 (Washington, D. C., 1954), especially pp. 12 f.
26. The decline of the older meaning of the baptismal renunciation has been instructively traced by H. Rahner, *op. cit.*
27. I have not been able to consult L. Kurz, *Gregors Lehre von den Engeln* (1938), nor J. Daniélou, *Les anges et leurs mission d'après les Pères* (Paris, 1952). It should be noted that for Anselm the object of salvation was to restore the elect to the likeness not merely of the first man before the fall but to the likeness of those angels who had never fallen and who are ever present at the divine liturgy. Also characteristic of his theory was Anselm's view that men so redeemed are being created and above all redeemed in numbers in excess of the fallen angels; in other words, progressively saved for their own sake as well as for God's honor and the repopulation of heaven; for, had honor and praise alone been His purpose, new angels or the requisite number of men fashioned without original sin like Christ himself could have been created to fill the vacant places in the heavenly city.
28. Karl Müller, "Der Umschwung in der Lehre von der Busse während des zwölften Jahrhunderts," *Theologische Abhandlungen*, C. von Weizsäcker gewidmet (Freiburg, 1892); Joseph A. Spitzig, *Sacramental Penance in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century*, Catholic University of America, S.S. Th. Studies, sec. VI (1947). Paul Anciaux, *au courant* the critical restriction of the Anselmian corpus, passes by Anselm after lauding him as vastly superior to his contemporaries, *La Théologie du Sacrament de Pénitence aux 12^e siècle* (Louvain, 1949). Several studies of the evolution of medieval penance fail on the role of Anselm because they used materials now withdrawn from Anselm by the critical editor of the *Opera omnia*, such as Polykarp Schmoll, *Die Busslehre der Früh-scholastik* (Munich, 1909), pp. 15-18; Bernhard Poschmann, *Die abendländische Kirchenbusse im frühen Mittelalter*, Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, XVI (Breslau, 1930).
29. Both Celtic penitential and Germanic law made a maxim of a basic distinction found also in *Cur Deus Homo*, I, xv, *aut poena aut satisfactio*.
30. See Franks, *op. cit.* J. Rivière noted that a supposed contemporary of Anselm, Radulphus Ardens, was the first to employ *satisfactio* of the work of Christ (*Le dogme*, p. 289); but Radulphus has since been assigned to the later twelfth century.
31. The most important new works to which reference will be made frequently are J. R. Geiselmann, *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte, vol. XV (Paderborn, 1926); Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1949); Ferdinand Holböck, *Der eucharistische und der mystische Leib Christi in ihren Beziehungen zueinander nach der Lehre der Früh-scholastik* (Rome, 1941); Josef Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia: Eine*

- genetische Erklärung der römischen Messe*, 2 vols. (Vienna, 1949); French ed. in 3 vols. (Paris, 1951-1954).
32. Migne, *PL*, CLXXII, col. 1250. The thrice-repeated *Agnus Dei* which was accompanied by the ritual division of the Host into three parts had long inspired reflection on the threefoldness of the Body and the Church. See de Lubac, *op. cit.*
 33. For the distinction between objective and subjective here, see Sebastiano Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, 2nd ed. (Rome, 1946), I, esp. p. 119.
 34. See above on Athanasius, p. 11.
 35. See, for example, *Cur Deus Homo*, I, ix: "...the just will which he had came not from his humanity but from his divinity."
 36. *Ibid.*, II, xiii.
 37. Described in his two natures, passible and impassible, *ibid.*, I, viii.
 38. Southern, *Middle Ages*, ch. v with plates.
 39. On the monastic vow as a kind of second baptism, see Odo Casel, "Die Mönchsweihe," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, V (1926), p. 23.
 40. R. W. Southern, "St. Anselm and Gilbert Crispin," *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, III (London, 1954), pp. 78-115.
 41. Migne, *PL*, CLIX, col. 1022.
 42. The basic text in the *Disputatio* at this point is Ezekiel 44:1-3, which is used by the Christian to explain the virginity of Mary *post partum*. The phrase "ut comedat panem coram Domino" is prominent in the discussion, but it is interpreted to mean that Christ was to do the will of the Lord.
 43. The authenticity of this section has been recently demonstrated. Southern, *Middle Ages*, pp. 226-229. Anselm here preserves the view of Adam's having gone over to the devil in a passage which makes Adam's fall plausible in terms of the feudal *diffidatio*. On *diffidatio*, *ibid.*, p. 234.
 44. *Op. cit.*, I, xx.
 45. Formerly *Oratio III*, Schmitt; *Op. om.*, III, p. 80, lines 7 f.
 46. On the evolution of the *missae privatae*, see Jungmann, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 272 ff.; and on the flowering of new prayers on the personal unworthiness of the priest before his own communion, *ibid.*, II, pp. 417 ff.
 47. Formerly LXIII; *Op. om.*, III, p. 26.
 48. *Loc. cit.*, p. 26, lines 20-22; p. 27, lines 26 f., 30 f., 38 f. *Oratio IX* (formerly LXIV) *ad sanctum Petrum* speaks of the soul as regenerated by the baptism of Christ and as a sheep bought by the blood of Christ even before it was born. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
 49. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
 50. Formerly XLI; *Op. om.*, II, p. 11.
 51. September 14: in quo est salus, vita et resurrectio nostra: per quem salvati et liberati sumus.
 52. *Loc. cit.*, p. 12, lines 51-55.
 53. *Ibid.*, p. 11, line 25; p. 12, lines 26, 44. The redemption of the penitents in purgatory is only implied in this context which places the action in the present and future. Christ's continuous descent into hell, i.e., by means of the eucharistic descent and the votive mass, is also implied in the Crispin Insert in reference to the saints of the Old Testament. *Loc. cit.*, col. 1022. See also above on *descensus*, p. 249, n. 19.
 54. *Op. cit.*, ed. John Wickham Legg, Henry Bradshaw Series, vol. V (London, 1893), coll. 517 ff.
 55. Formerly XXXIV; *Op. om.*, II, p. 10.
 56. Anselm elsewhere uses Romans 6:3 ff. for baptism but without the same inner appropriation which characterizes its use here. *De sacrificio azimi et fermentati*, IV; *Op. om.*, II, p. 228.
 57. On the general eleventh-century use of *in ore* and *in corde*, see Sheedy, *op. cit.*, p. 173.
 58. Markus Barth doubts whether this passage was sacramental as used by Paul, though it certainly was so used by the Fathers. *Die Taufe, ein Sakrament?* (Zurich, 1951).
 59. P. 10, lines 13 f.
 60. Jungmann discusses the prayers inspired by the Capernaite centurion, *op. cit.*, II, 431 ff.
 61. Line 17.
 62. Formerly LII; *Op. om.*, III, pp. 18-25; recently translated by Eugene Fairweather, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-207.
 63. See, for example, H. Coathale, *Le parallélisme entre la sainte Vierge et l'Eglise dans la tradition latine jusqu'à la fin du XII^e siècle*, Analecta Gregoriana, Theol., LXXIV (Rome, 1954), pp. 74 ff.
 64. Migne, *PL*, CLIX, col. 575.
 65. *Loc. cit.*, p. 22, lines 102 f.
 66. *Ibid.*, p. 23, lines 139 f.
 67. *Ibid.*, p. 19, line 46.
 68. *Ibid.*, p. 21, lines 81, 84.
 69. *Ibid.*, p. 19, line 40.
 70. *Ibid.*, p. 24, line 147.
 71. *Op. om.*, II, p. 139.
 72. On Anselm's doctrine of original sin as a break from Augustine, see Fairweather, *op. cit.*, p. 58; R. M. Martin, "La question du Péché originel dans s. Anselme," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, V (1911), p. 735; Odon Lottin, *Psychologie et morale au XII^e et XIII^e siècle*, IV, 3:1 (Louvain, 1954), p. 13.
 73. The appetites are not sins; otherwise they would have been removed in baptism, *op. cit.*, cap. iv. p. 144.
 74. *Ibid.*, cap., xxvii, p. 170.
 75. *Ibid.*, cap., ii, p. 141.
 76. In a gesture to the sensibilities of feudal society, Anselm at one point in *De originali peccato* seeks to explain the liability of the progeny to the punish-

- ment of their primal parents, not in terms of propagation, but of the corporate responsibility of a noble family. A man and spouse, having been established in their possessions by grace alone, when they inexcusably commit a grave crime, are not only themselves disgraced but their sons are also made to follow them into servitude. *Cap. xxviii*, p. 171.
77. *Ibid.*, *cap. xxiv*, p. 166.
78. *Ibid.*, *capp. viii-xxi*, and especially his statement at the end of *cap. ii* and beginning of *cap. xxii*.
79. *Ibid.*, *capp. xxiii, xxvii*, and especially *cap. xxii*, p. 165: As I have said (*cap. i*), there is a sin that comes from the nature, and a sin that comes from the person. Thus, what is from the person can be called "personal," and what is from nature "natural"—otherwise "original."
80. *Cap. xxii*: Christ alone pays more than they owe for all who are saved.
81. Cf. Ferdinand Holböck, *Der eucharistische und der mystische Leib Christi in ihren Beziehungen zueinander nach der Lehre der Frühscholastik* (Rome, 1941), in a section entitled "Die Beziehungen der Taufe zur Eucharistie bei Bewirkung der Eingliederung in den mystischen Leib," pp. 215-218, where, however, Anselm is not classified either way. An earlier treatment of the way in which the participation was implied in baptism at least *ex voto* from earliest times is that of E. Springer, "Unsere Einverleibung in Christus durch die Eucharistie," *Theologie und Glaube*, V (1913), p. 15; "Taufgnade als Kraftwirkung der Eucharistie," *Divus Thomas*, VIII (1930), p. 421. The problem of distinctive sacramental graces over against the *ex voto* identity of all sacramental action is historically and systematically discussed by Lawrence P. Everett, *The Nature of Sacramental Grace*, Catholic University of America, Studies in Sacred Theology 2nd ser., VII (Washington, 1948).
82. *Op. cit.*, *xxix*, p. 172.
83. *Libri sancti Anselmi 'Cur Deus homo' prima forma inedita*, Analecta Gregoriana, III (Rome, 1933).
84. In "Un premier jet du 'Cur Deus homo'," *Revue des sciences religieuses*, XIV (1934), p. 329; XVI (1936), pp. 1-3.
85. It is from St. Omer that the *Liber Floridus* containing one copy of our *Libellus* derives. This evidence comes from a letter of one Bishop Malchius, formerly of St. Omer, in which Anselm is asked to dictate a copy of the sermon on the incarnation of Christ delivered to the monks in the refectory on the feast of St. Martin. Schmitt suggests that Anselm delivered his "first draft" of *Cur Deus Homo* apropos of the dedication of the altar in St. Omer while he was staying at the abbey of St. Bertin. Whether Anselm sent a copy of the completed *Cur Deus Homo* to Bishop Malchius in Ireland is not known. But we may conjecture with Schmitt that a monk of St. Omer, possibly the compiler of the *Liber Floridus*, read the, by now complete, *Cur Deus Homo*, and perhaps recalled other more liturgical features of the original sermon when he came to write down the *Libellus*. "Zur Entstehungsgeschichte von Anselm's 'Cur Deus homo,'" *Theologische Revue*, XXXIV (1935), p. 218; Druwé maintained his position in "La première rédaction du *Cur Deus homo* de S. Anselme," *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XXXVI (1935), pp. 501-540. De Ghellinck was inclined to agree. *L'Esor de la littérature latine au XII^e siècle*, I (Brussels, 1946), p. 38.
86. *Revue Bénédictine*, XXXIII (1931), p. 52.
87. Formerly *Meditatio XI*, it has more recently been renumbered as one of the three meditations which under the searching scrutiny of editor Schmitt have survived the tests of authenticity.
88. *Loc. cit.*, p. 90, line 160. The solar motif is very prominent in the ancient baptismal *descensus* cycle. See Lundberg, *op. cit.*
89. *Ibid.*, lines 173 f.
90. *Loc. cit.*, p. 90, lines 180-186. Original sin is also mentioned, p. 89, line 156; p. 90, lines 175 f.
91. *Ibid.*, lines 164-167.
92. The Augsburg Confession protestingly calls attention to the completion of this trend: "There was added an opinion, which increased private Masses infinitely: to wit, that Christ by his passion did satisfy for original sin, and appointed the Mass, wherein an oblation should be made for daily sins, both mortal and venial." Part II, *De missa*, art. 8.
93. *Loc. cit.*, p. 88, lines 122-128. The sequel of this passage is quoted below, p. 266 at n. 120.
94. I, 20; *Op. om.*, p. 86, referred to above, p. 254.
95. In the *Libellus* the devil does not play a part in the parable; the precious pearl has simply fallen. God's concern for all his rational creation, symbolized by the originally pure pearl, is especially stressed. *Op. cit.*, *cap. xxiv*, p. 21.
96. *De incarnatione Verbi Dei*, ix; see above, p. 249.
97. An allusion to the descent into hell, to save those who died before Christ's first advent. See above, p. 249 at n. 19.
98. *Op. cit.*, ii, 16; *Op. om.*, p. 118; Fairweather, p. 167, from which this translation is adapted.
99. *Op. om.*, p. 117, lines 6 f.
100. *Op. om.*, p. 116, line 19.
101. In the *Disputatio* of Crispin: *nostras*

- restitutionis sacramentum* (loc. cit., col. 1023 C), also: *et originalis peccati hostia et propitiatio . . . atque humani generis plena integraque restitutio*; cf. *Libellus* II, p. 30 and xxxvii, p. 35: *salutis nostre sacramentum*, which is said to have flowed from the wounded side of Christ. In both cases *sacramentum* has the generic sense of "mystery" and the more specific sense of "sacrament." Leo I also speaks of *sacramentum mortis et resurrectionis*, *Sermo LIY, cap. ii* and *LII, ii*, but with a less technical sense of *sacramentum*. Augustine had likewise derived the sacrament of the chalice *a latere*; but Zeno of Verona, for example, as a fourth-century survivor of a still older view, held that the water and blood flowing from the side of Christ represented the two forms of baptism, i.e., in water and in blood. See de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, pp. 14 and 75. Another and more common interpretation is that the water and blood are the sources of the two sacraments, baptism and the eucharist. See Holböck, p. 52 *et passim*.
102. *Cur Deus Homo*, I, 20; *Op. om.*, p. 132.
 103. *Meditatio III, Op. om.*, p. 88.
 104. *Ibid.*
 105. *Libellus*, loc. cit., p. 30.
 106. *Op. om.*, II, p. 24.
 107. *Cur Deus Homo*, II, cap. xviii; *Op. om.*, II, p. 129; ". . . he offered himself for his own honor to himself, that is, his humanity to his divinity, which is itself one of the three persons."
 108. See, for example, Athanasius quoted above, p. 250 at n. 23.
 109. Cf. Baruch 3:38.
 110. *Cur Deus Homo*, I, ii, p. 11.
 111. *Op. cit.*, p. 89, lines 146 f. On the eucharist as *imitatio passionis* and on union with Christ as the effect of the sacrament, see Sheedy, *op. cit.*, p. 123.
 112. *Cur Deus Homo*, II, p. 19; *Op. om.*, p. 130: *Frustra quippe imitatores eius erunt, si meriti eius participes non erunt*. In the next line Anselm assimilates *imitator* to heir and joint-heir (the baptismal testamentary language of Romans). See quotation above, p. 261 at n. 92.
 113. *Ibid.*; also cap. ii, p. 17; p. 124.
 114. *Cur Deus Homo*, I, 20; *Op. om.*, p. 132.
 115. For example, the prayer *Domine Jesu Christe* in the present Roman Missal right after the *Agnus Dei* is referred to c. 1100 as an *oratio*, allegedly of St. Augustine, "*ad Filium quem ante se tenet*;" discussed by Jungmann, *op. cit.*, II, p. 424, esp. n. 32 and also p. 421, n. 15. The Westminster Missal reads: "*Deus pater, qui . . . unigenitum tuum . . . carnem sumere voluisti, quem ego hic in manibus meis teneo . . .*"
 116. Ed. John Wickham Legg, Henry Bradshaw Society, II, col. 517.
 117. The bridal image appears fleetingly in the following quotation (inflammatory love) and at the end of the *Meditatio*, where Anselm combines the image of the *cubiculum amoris* with thought of tasting "*per amorem*," what he tastes "*per cognitionem*." *Loc. cit.*, p. 91, lines 196 and 203.
 118. *Op. cit.*, p. 84.
 119. Cf. above, pp. 264-5.
 120. *Ibid.*, p. 89, lines 132-136.
 121. *Loc. cit.*, xxxii, p. 30.
 122. *Ibid.*, lines 84-87. The reference to entering into the Kingdom on feet healed of the serpent's wound is an allusion to Christ's washing the feet of Peter and the others at the Last Supper in John 13, where the *lavatio pedum*, in contrast to the Synoptic accounts, overshadows the establishment of the eucharist. Elsewhere the compiler speaks like Ignatius of Antioch of the eucharist as *peccati medicina* (line 17). The medicinal allusion is also related to the Capernaite *Non sum dignus* based on Matthew 8:8 (see above, p. 258), which includes Jesus' curing of the centurion's servant. See Jungmann, *op. cit.* On the relationship of baptism and eucharist in respect to the apostles and the medical imagery connected with the Johannine version of the eucharist, see Kantorowicz, *op. cit.*, esp. p. 252.
 123. Holböck, *op. cit.*, has traced these two trends and in a special section (esp. 209-214) has dealt with the problem of the depression of baptism as a result (pp. 215-218).
 124. E. C. DeClerck, "Questions de sotériologie médiévale," *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, XIII (1946), p. 160. Honorius is not able completely to break with the older feeling that somehow also the devil has a more important role than Anselm had been willing to assign him.
 125. *Gemma*, I, 36; Migne, *PL*, CLXXII, col. 555; quoted by Holböck, *op. cit.*, p. 59, n. 123.
 126. *Elucidarium* I, 28; Migne, *PL*, CLXXII, col. 1129; Rupert of Deutz says "*made concorporal*." *Ibid.*, CLXVII, col. 1665C.
 127. *Ibid.*, col. 1189C; quoted by Holböck, *op. cit.*, p. 58, n. 118.
 128. *Eucharistion*, ii; Migne, *PL*, CLXXII, coll. 1250-51; quoted by Holböck, *op. cit.*, p. 56, n. 114.
 129. J. R. Geiselmann first suggested the possibility of a connection between Anselm's individualistic interpretation of the eucharist and his theory of redemption. *Die Eucharistielehre der Vorscholastik*, *Forschungen zur Christlichen Literatur- und Dogmengeschichte*, XV (Paderborn, 1926), pp. 409-413. But Geiselmann assumed that Anselm's eucharistic theology was derived

- from his theory of redemption (p. 409) rather than, as we have been arguing, that his theory of the atonement was a rationalization of his eucharistic experience and practice. Moreover, Geiselmann based his construction largely upon *ep. 107 of lib. iv*, several prayers, and *Meditatio IV*, all of which Schmitt has withdrawn from Anselm.
130. Matthew 26:39, 42 and parallels and Philippians 2:8 f. are prominent in the argumentation of *Cur Deus Homo*, I, viii and ix; also in the eucharistic reflections of *Meditatio III*. On Anselm's "evangelical" view of penance and his departure from Tertullian, see McIntyre, *op. cit.*, p. 87.
 131. Above, pp. 249-50.
 132. H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum et definitionum*, no. 430.
 133. *De originali peccato*, vi; *Op. om.*, II, p. 147, l. 14.
 134. *Ibid.*, xxiii, p. 165.

THE CATHOLIC REFORM IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

GEORGE H. TAVARD, *Assumption College, Worcester, Mass.*

The many aspects of Catholic activity during the sixteenth century make it difficult to present a systematic bibliography for that period. Interest in the Reformation era has considerably increased among Catholic scholars during the last decades. We must therefore proceed to a severe selection. Only studies that deal with the most significant topics will be included. No breakdown of the material can be completely satisfactory. As the main point, however, is to give as clear a picture as possible, one must distinguish three broad periods: before, during and after the Council of Trent. Subdivisions of the subject matter in each period will necessarily overlap. But we will reduce this to a minimum.

The decades that separated Luther's theses (1517) from the opening of the Council of Trent (1545) are noteworthy for the attempts of Catholics, especially in Germany, to formulate an intellectual reply to the Reformers. The polemical productions of Catholic theologians reach enormous proportions. They go from short pamphlets to bulky volumes. On the whole, this theology of anti-Lutheran controversialists is badly known. That scholars have now noticed its importance is however clear from Hubert Jedin's article: "Die geschichtliche Bedeutung der katholischen Kontroversliteratur im Zeit der Glaubensspaltung" (*Historische Jahrbuch*, vol. 53, 1933, pp. 70ff). Jedin provides a general outline of this literature and surveys the studies made of it before 1933. The following pages cover, approximately, the books published since then.

I. Pre-Tridentine Catholics. Texts.

The major difficulty that stands in the way of a better acquaintance with these Catholic polemicists lies in the relative rarity of recent editions of their works. The *Corpus catholico-*

rum in course of publication in Münster is steadily filling this gap.

One of the main adversaries of Luther, Johann Cochläus, is featured in vol. 17, in which Hilarius Walter has published Cochläus's Latin essay: *Aequitatis discussio super consilio delectorum cardinalium*, of 1538 (1931). This short work answers the comments of the Strasbourg Reformer Johann Sturm (*De emendatione ecclesiae et religionis controversiis*, 1538) on the famous "advice concerning the reform of the Church" signed on March 9, 1537, by nine cardinals, among whom were the lay Cardinal Gasparo Contarini, the Englishman Pole and the future Pope Carafa. In vol. 18 of the same series, (*Drei Schriften gegen Luthers Schmalkaldische Artikel*, 1932) Hans Volz has published three German works by Johann Cochläus (*Ein nötig und christlich Bedenken auf des Luthers Artickeln*, 1538), Johann Witzel (*Antwort auf M. Luthers bekennete Artickel*, 1538) and Johann Hoffmeister (*Warhafftige Endeckung und Widerlegung deren Artickel*, 1539). While these are only secondary writings, they throw light on the reception of the Schmalkald articles in Catholic circles.

Nicholaus Ellenbog, a Benedictine monk at Ottobeuren Abbey in Bavaria, is little known. Yet he was on friendly terms with the main Catholic theologians of his country and he was acquainted with some of the Protestants. His letters are therefore important for the history of the period. Written between 1504 and 1543, they were addressed to men as influential as Johann Eck. Andreas Bigelmair and Friderich Zoepfl have edited them in vol. 19/21 of *Corp. cath.: Nikolaus Ellenbog: Briefwechsel*, 1938. The most interesting letters are unabridged. Others are given in digest form. The

long introduction is most valuable for its analysis of the ideas of Ellenbog as humanist and as theologian.

Johann Fabri is another Southern German writer who deserves to be better known. As vicar general of the diocese of Constance, he argued against Zwingli at the Zürich disputation of 1523. His outstanding writing is a *Malleus in Haeresim lutheranam* (1524). The first half of it (on the Pope's authority) is published by Anton Naegele as vol. 23/4 (1941). With the works of Eck on the same topic, Fabri's essay forms a stepping-stone in the development of Catholic thinking concerning the Papacy. Though they were written before 1517, two works of Cardinal Cajetan should be mentioned at this point, for they betray the same preoccupation, in a less polemical manner. His *De comparatione auctoritatis papae et concilii* (composed in 1511 against the schismatic council of Pisa) and the *Apologia* of this treatise (1512, aiming at the conciliaristic implications of Jacques Almain's *De auctoritate ecclesiae*) played a notable role in fighting off conciliaristic conceptions among the anti-Lutheran controversialists. They have been published by V. M. I. Pollet (*Thomas de Vio: Scripta theologica*, vol. 1, 1936).

Vol. 22 of *Corp. cath.* (Thomas Murner in *Schweitzer Glaubenskampf*, 1939), edited by Wolfgang Pfeiffer-Belli, contains a 1526 letter on the Baden disputation of 1523, a longer "Answer" to Zwingli, also of 1526, and a third pamphlet treating of the Bern disputation of 1528. Thomas Murner was not only involved in theological debates. He attained more notoriety as a popular satirical author. His pieces in this somewhat untheological genre played no small part in fighting the spread of the Reformation in some areas. His *Von dem grossen lutherischen Narren* (1525) has been published in common with a similar production of Daniel von Soest: Arnold E. Bergen: *Satirische Feldzüge wider die Reformation* (1933).

II. Pre-Tridentine polemicists. Studies.

Scholars are not only interested in publishing the texts of the anti-Pro-

estant authors. Several monographs and some full-scale studies are now available on the doctrine of these writers.

Johann Eck deserves to be mentioned first. His views on the Eucharist have been studied by Erwin Iserloh: *Die Eucharistie in der Darstellung des J. Ecks* (1950, *Ref. gesch. Studien u. Texte* n. 73/4). Iserloh centers his work on Eck's conception of the Eucharist as offering. This occupies the longest chapter of the book. Yet it is regrettable that the Real Presence and Transubstantiation, which were the most basic points at issue, are dealt with rapidly, in connexion with communion. Yet this contribution should be consulted by all who want to delve in the pre-Tridentine Eucharistic controversies.

Eck's friend and co-fighter, Johann Cochläus, published in 1549 his *Commentaria de actis et scriptis Lutheri*. As they view Luther through the eyes of one of his arch-opponents, they have been somewhat neglected as a source of documentation. In his *Die Lutherkommentare des J. Cochläus* (1935, *Ref. gesch. Studien u. Texte*, n. 33) Adolf Herte has shown their value. They provide a mirror of the whole Reformation period, where most of the persons involved and the various controversies are described by one who knew all the former and was active in all the latter. Herte studies at length the sources used by Cochläus and his method of work. In a subsequent book (*Das katholische Lutherbild im Bann der Lutherkommentare des Cochläus*, 3 vol., 1943) Herte shows the influence of the *Commentaria* on the judgments passed on Luther by Catholics. The greater part of the first volume deals with the sixteenth century: Catholics knew Luther, to a great extent, through Cochläus, a fact which may be regretted, since Cochläus was hostile to the person, no less than to the doctrines, of Luther.

Josse Clichtove is interesting, though little known. His *Antilutherus* and his *Propugnaculum* were noted in their time. R. Desreumaux has ably analysed them: *Une réputation surfaite? Josse Clichtove* (*Mélanges de*

Science Religieuse, 1949, pp. 253 ff). He seems, however, to have fallen into the understandable exaggeration of scholars enthralled by their topic: he declares Clichtove to have been "in his country the first theologian of his time." Clichtove is impressive, but hardly, in my judgment, the first. Yet Clichtove certainly was a better theologian than Nikolaus Ellenbog, who is sympathetically presented by Andreas Bigelmair: *Ellenbog und die Reformation (Festgabe Alois Knöpfler, 1937, pp. 18 ff)*.

Albert Pigge was greater than both. Hubert Jedin's *Studien über die Schriftstellertätigkeit Albert Pigge* (1938, *Ref. gesch. Studien u. Texte*, n. 55) assigns great importance to him. Pigge was instrumental in formulating the idea of tradition as a source of faith distinct from Scripture. He also belonged to the group of Catholics who developed a concept of "double righteousness." This attempt at mediation between Luther and Catholic theology throws light on the decree of Trent on justification. Another writer who favored this "double justice" was Johann Gropper, the young vicar general who saved Cologne for Catholicism when the Archbishop Hermann von Wied leaned to and finally embraced Lutheranism. Walter Lipgens has published an overall study of this attractive personality: *Kardinal Johannes Gropper und die Anfänge der katholischen Reforms in Deutschland* (1951). Lipgens shows Gropper's part in the Provincial Council of Cologne in 1536, which ultimately decided the fate of the diocese. Yet Gropper was a moderate. His view on "double righteousness" is a token of this. And so is his support of the Emperors in the 1540's: Gropper attended the three colloquies of Haguenau, Worms and Regensburg and was prominent in the redaction of the Regensburg Book.

The *Johann Fabri* (1941, *Ref. gesch. Studien u. Texte*, n. 67/8) of Leo Helbling also traces a general study of the life and activity of the vicar general of Constance, who was later made Bishop of Vienna. Like Gropper, Fabri came from humanistic

circles. He also attended several Diets and *Religionsgespräche*. Fabri, who was immediately involved in the struggle of Swiss Catholics against Zwingli, also held a noteworthy part in the polemics of Germany proper with his writings against Luther.

We do not leave the theology of justification with Otfried Müller's *Die Rechtfertigungslehre nominalistischer Reformationsgegner: Bartholomäus Arnoldi von Usingen und Kaspar Schatzgeyer* (1940). Usingen, an Augustinian, taught at Erfurt when Luther attended the University. Schatzgeyer, a Franciscan, was one of the few who wrote against Luther without insulting him. Both favored the concept of "double righteousness." Yet this reviewer would think that Müller should have been slower to call Schatzgeyer a nominalist: on the whole, Schatzgeyer was far more in the traditional Franciscan line of Bonaventure and Scotus than in that of Ockham.

How Franciscanism faced the Reformation is illustrated in Edmund Kurten's study of *Franz Lambert von Avignon und Nikolaus Herborn* (1950, *Ref. gesch. Studien u. Texte*, n. 72). The former joined the Protestants. The latter became, with Schatzgeyer, a first-rate anti-Lutheran theologian. Kurten deals more explicitly with the polemics that took place when Lambert, in 1524, explained why he had left the Order. Herborn's wider interests are also considered. This is excellent. For Herborn has a right to be read as a truly prominent theologian. Of all the anti-Lutheran polemicists, Schatzgeyer may perhaps be the only one who could make the same claim.

Among the monographs on these other writers one should finally mention the *Alfonso de Castro* of T. Olarte (Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica, 1946). A vigorous figure of Spanish theology, Alfonso stepped into polemics with his *Adversus omnes haereses* (1534). However, Olarte is more interested in Alfonso's ideas concerning philosophy and law than in his theological writings.

The problem of justification is not the only one that has recently attracted

attention. In 1932 a masterful book by Pontien Polman was devoted to the problem of tradition: *L'élément historique dans la controverse religieuse du XVI^e siècle*. Polman dealt only by the way with the theory of tradition, when he studied the doctrinal justification for the history of dogma, especially as it was conceived at the Council of Trent. However, he made a very thorough investigation of what knowledge of history Catholics and Protestants enjoyed, and he outlined their use of that knowledge in the course of their polemics. Further interest in tradition has been displayed more lately. In *La notion de tradition dans la théologie de Jean Driedo* (*Ephemerides theologiae lovanienses*, vol. 26, 1950, pp. 37 ff) J. Lodrioor thinks that Driedo's *De ecclesiasticis scripturis et dogmatibus* (1533) contains a twofold concept of tradition: an "active" tradition is the vehicle of both Scripture and "passive" traditions. Yet Lodrioor seems to have read into the mind of Driedo more than his texts allow. This at least is the reaction of the present writer to Lodrioor's thesis. That the Catholics were not of one mind on this question is clear from a comparison between Driedo and Ellenbog. This has been made possible by an article of this reviewer, who may be allowed to refer to it here: *A forgotten theology of inspiration: Nikolaus Ellenbog's refutation of Scriptura sola* (*Franciscan Studies*, vol. 15, 1955, pp. 106 ff). A manuscript kept at Ottoheuren Abbey, *Contra nunnulla dogmata lutheranorum*, shows that for Ellenbog tradition results from successive revelations still being made to the Church. This conception was favored by several other pre-Tridentine polemicists. But it will not tally with the relevant decree of the Council of Trent.

III. Pre-Tridentine Catholic "Evangelism."

The expression "evangelism" may not be entirely fortunate here. Its connotations are vague. As the term has been recently used, it applies to the Catholic circles that refused to react to the Protestant movement through hostile polemics. They rather tried to

strike a balance between the extreme parties. They wanted to unite the Reformers' concern for the Gospel (whence the word "evangelism") and the Catholic loyalty to the institution of the church.

These groups were under the more or less direct influence of Erasmus. We may therefore begin this section with the definitive study of Marcel Bataillon, *Erasmus et l'Espagne* (1937). Erasmianism, which invaded Spain around 1530 after a long infiltration, fitted well into the mentality fostered by Garcia de Cisneros and the Spanish pre-reformation. Though it was sporadically denounced to the Spanish Inquisition, it was favored by the Emperor Charles V. The humanism of Erasmus lay at the root of most irenic attempts in the sixteenth century. This is also emphasized by R. Stupperich's *Der Humanismus und die Wiedereinigung der Konfessionen* (1936, *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte*). Stupperich explains only the German side of the movement. He traces it in the growth of the concept of "double righteousness," especially in the adoption of that concept by the colloquies of Haguenau, Worms and Regensburg. Most of the Catholic collocutors were disciples of Erasmus.

Outside of Spain and Germany, the influence of these conciliatory tendencies was also felt in Italy, particularly when Juan de Valdès left Spain for Italy in 1529. Valdès was influential through his writings. *El alfabeto cristiano* (1546) has been published by Benedetto Croce (1938) and *Le cento e dieci divine consideratione* (1550) by Edmondo Cione (1944). The former is the most suggestive of Valdès's works from the point of view of the spiritual life. The latter treats also of the same questions. Yet it is important as a testimony to the dogmatic beliefs of Valdès. That he was always faithful to Catholic orthodoxy is usually admitted. This is the conclusion arrived at by John E. Longhurst: *Erasmus and the Spanish Inquisition. The case of Juan de Valdès* (1950). This would also be my conclusion. Yet I have doubts on the relevance of Long-

hurst's points of reference. Does he not "summarise" Catholic doctrine as "obedience to Rome, observance of the sacraments, the doctrine of the Trinity, belief in the seven sins and virtues and the five commandments of the Church"? For a scholar, what an amazing hodgepodge! The short biography of *Juan de Valdès* (1938) by Edmondo Cione will give a better-rounded picture. Yet its emphasis on the Protestant leanings of Valdès may be overdone.

Valdès was one of the leading figures in the circle that centered around Vittoria Colonna. Eva-Maria Jung has drawn a short portrait of this appealing personality: *Vittoria Colonna: between Reformation and Counter-Reformation* (*Review of Religion*, vol. 15, 1950/1, pp. 144 ff.). The ideas that were aired in her salon and the influence that she and her friends had are explained in another article by the same writer: *On the nature of Evangelism in sixteenth century Italy* (*Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 14, 1953, pp. 511 ff.). Next to Vittoria, and perhaps more central in this group than she herself was, we find Cardinal Pole. A cousin of Henry VIII, he did not return to England when the royal supremacy was proclaimed. Henry took revenge by having his mother executed. Wilhelm Schenk has painted a short but sensitive portrait of this man, who was alternately hesitant and resolute: *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England* (1950). Pole's relations to the English Reformation and to the Catholic Reform in Italy are well handled. Pole deserves more credit than he usually receives for his moderating activity in the England of Mary Tudor.

Contarini, the Venetian diplomat who, as a Cardinal, was legate in Germany and the leading mind behind the Regensburg Colloquy, was another friend of Vittoria Colonna. Early in life, Contarini perceived the necessity of a reform of the Church. This spiritual crisis oriented him toward taking an irenic view of the Reformers. Hubert Jedin has given us the story of this as it can be traced from Contarini's letters to Thomas Giustiniani: *Ein 'Turmerlebnis' des jungen Contarini*

(*Historisches Jahrbuch*, vol. 70, 1951, pp. 115 ff.).

With George Cassander we are no longer in Spanish or Italian Evangelism. Yet Cassander was from the Low Countries. His ideas belong to Erasmian evangelism. In *Georgius Cassander en zijn oecumenisch streven* (1951) Maria E. Nolte studies this intriguing theologian. Cassander always remained in the Catholic Church. Yet he made notable dogmatic concessions. His ecclesiology, which recognised Lutheranism and Calvinism as "branches" of the Church, was hardly orthodox. This watering down of doctrine for the sake of irenicism was short-lived. Neither the birth nor the growth of the idea of tolerance was linked to it. The two volumes of Joseph Lecler: *Histoire de la tolérance au siècle de la Réforme* (1955) trace the history of the development of religious tolerance in the sixteenth century, in Catholic as well as in Protestant lands. The story is impressive and should help to counterweight popular misconceptions. The political tolerance of religious dissent was, to no meagre extent, due to the influence of the Catholic humanists.

England is usually not associated with this Erasmian evangelism. Yet Sir Thomas More is undoubtedly in the same line of thought. There always are many books on More. Of biographies we may be satisfied with a mention of the *St. Thomas More* (1953) of E. E. Reynolds, who also wrote a counterpart to it, *St. John Fisher* (1955). These excellent lives reflect the situation of England at the time. Among More's works, the *Utopia* is still a favorite. Mme M. Delcourt published in 1936 a critical edition of the Latin text: *Thomas More. L'Utopie*. This should be the standard of reference for those who try to interpret this puzzling book. What is the purport of the *Utopia*? For H. W. Donner (*Introduction to Utopia*, 1945), More wanted to paint a picture of the "state of society to which man can attain without Revelation." The religious tolerance advocated by More is valid in the hypothesis of a purely natural religion, in which one formula is as good as another. Though Donner does not say so,

we may perhaps conclude that More tried to make an indirect demonstration of the necessity of Revelation. This at least would be the angle that makes best sense of the *Utopia*. P. Huber (*Traditionsfestigkeit und Traditionskritik bei Thomas Morus*, 1953) falls probably wider of the mark. For him the *Utopia* is More's criticism of political and religious tradition.

Since we are speaking of England, we may end this section with two books that do not directly treat of the Erasmian tradition. *L'Angleterre catholique à la veille du schisme* (1935), by Pierre Janelle, could be considered a study of the failures of religious moderates when they are harassed by determined politicians. Janelle shows how Bishop Stephen Gardiner and other English churchmen of a conciliating mind were gradually fooled into schism by Henry VIII and his political advisers. The Roman legate Campeggio, who went to England for the purpose of gaining time for the Pope on the matter of the King's divorce is often blamed for much of the following mess. Edward V. Cardinal makes a gallant attempt to rehabilitate him: *Cardinal Lorenzo Campeggio* (1935). Campeggio was neither an ecclesiastical Machiavelli nor a corrupt bishop. But his good intentions and his moderate abilities did not help him handle a very difficult situation.

IV. Council of Trent. Texts.

The Görresgesellschaft continues to publish its huge collection of texts concerning the Council of Trent, the now indispensable source-book for any study of the Council. Vol. 11 came out in 1937: *Epistolarum pars secunda*, edited by Godfrey Buschell. It contains letters to and from members of the Council, and communications from the Emperor and other political figures concerning the course followed by the discussions. The period covered goes from March 13, 1547, to the adjournment of the Council in 1552. During the Council theologians were asked for their written opinion on various debated questions. These "tractates" are most useful for the history of the debates that prepared the decrees. Vincent Schweitzer and Hubert Jedin

have now published them: *Concilii Tridentini tractatum pars secunda* (1938). The treatises in this volume were written between the translation of the Council in August 1546 and the 22d session in 1562. The most recent volume of the Görresgesellschaft, *Acta Concilii Bononiensis* (1950, vol. 6) contains the edition, by Sebastian Merkle and S. Freudenberger, of Massarelli's acts of the two sessions that took place in Bologna in 1548.

As secretary for the Council, Massarelli played an important part in preserving the acts of the meetings. Under the title of *Decreta septem priorum sessionum Concilii Tridentini* (1945) Stephen Kuttner has published a photostatic reproduction of Massarelli's autograph of the decrees of the first seven sessions. This adds nothing to our knowledge of those decrees. Its very limited interest comes from the fact that the manuscript in question is deposited in the Morgan Library in New York.

The most controversial historian of the Council is Paolo Sarpi (1552-1623) whose "anti-curial" interpretation provoked Pallavicino's long refutation. His *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino* is always worth consulting, in spite of its bias. It has now been re-edited in three volumes by Giovanni Gambarini (1935). This text is the first which is completely faithful to Sarpi's manuscripts in the Marciana Library in Venice. It therefore is particularly reliable.

V. Council of Trent. General works.

The most competent modern historian of the Council is no doubt Hubert Jedin, now at Bonn University, whose name will recur often in these pages. With *Das Konzil von Trient. Ein Ueberblick über die Erforschung seiner Geschichte* (1948) Jedin has given a historian's appreciation of historical studies and points of view concerning the Council. He takes us from the source books of Massarelli and others to the labors of the Görresgesellschaft, via the contradictory angles of Sarpi and Pallavicino. To Pallavicino Jedin has also devoted a special book: *Der Quellenapparat der Konzilsgeschichte Pallavicinos* (1940). The problem is

the reliability of Pallavicino's information. Jedin discusses this in the light of documents in the archives of the Gregorian University. Pallavicino's thoroughness of information is amazing. Although he wrote with the avowed purpose of correcting Sarpi's slant, his use of his sources is fair and objective. But a modern reader is not always at home in the tomes of Pallavicino. Jedin is therefore writing his own history of the Council. His *Geschichte des Konzils von Trient* will probably become the standard history of the Council resulting from modern research. To date only the first volume is out (1949). It covers the preparation of the Council and the growth of the idea of reform, from the Council of Basle (1482) to the eve of Trent (1545).

We enter the Council itself with A. Michel: *Les décrets du Concile de Trente* (1938, vol. 10 of Hefele's *Histoire des Conciles*). As the political aspects of the Council were dealt with in two previous volumes of Hefele's *Histoire* (*Le Concile de Trente*, by P. Richard, 1930 and 1931), Michel restricts himself to the inner story of the debates. He is, however, primarily a systematic theologian. His book is materially fair but it lacks historical perspective in its appreciation of the trends that clashed in the lobbies and the sessions of the Council. Léon Cristiani, with *L'Eglise à l'époque du Concile de Trente* (1948, vol. 17 of Fliche's *Histoire de l'Eglise*), offers a better account of the historical circumstances. But he treats superficially, and not always accurately, the theological implications of the debates. *Das Weltkonzil von Trient. Sein Werden und Wirken* (edited by Georg Schreiber, 2 vol., 1951) is a symposium. The first volume groups twenty contributions on several aspects of the doctrinal importance and influence of the Council. The second, with nineteen essays, treats of the connexions of a number of localities, dioceses or religious Orders with the Council. Though its subject-matter is somewhat disparate, this is a first-rate work, in which one finds all the greater names of German Catholic scholarship.

VI. Council of Trent. Studies of various Sessions.

The first major Session of Trent was the fourth. It published the decree of April 8, 1546, on Holy Scripture. Several aspects of this decree have retained attention. A long book by P. G. Duncker: *De singulis Sacrae Scripturae libris controversis in Concilio Tridentino* (1951, *Studia Anselmiana*, n. 27/8) takes us through the discussions on the canon of the Bible. These ended with the inclusion of the deuterocanonical books (frequently called "apocryphal" by Protestant writers) in the Catholic canon. Duncker explains the details of the debates which thus put a stop to recurrent controversies.

The same Session "canonized" the Vulgate. In his contribution to *La Bibbia e il Concilio di Trento* (1947) Giacoma Vostè deals with this in conventional fashion, bringing nothing new (*La Volgata al Concilio di Trento*, pp. 1 ff). Of the other two lectures of this symposium, only one is of interest for the Council: *Esegesi ed esegesi al Concilio di Trento*, by Alberto Vaccari. We are on the contrary indebted to A. Allgeier for a stimulating research on the meaning of the word "Vulgate" in the decree of 1546: *Haec vetus et vulgata editio* (in *Biblica*, vol. 29, 1948, pp. 353 ff). Allgeier investigates the use of the expression "Vulgate" before and during the Council. Among other points, he shows that Erasmus called "Vulgate" any popular version of the Bible. As far as the official pronouncement of the Council is concerned, Allgeier traces the meaning of "Vulgate" back to Titelmans, a theologian who was consulted by the legate of Cervini. The decree used the vocabulary of Titelmans. For Titelmans, "Vulgate" designates any older version (the Septuagint, the *Vetus latina*, our Latin Vulgate) as opposed to modern translations. The Septuagint is the most authentic "Vulgate" text, of which the so-called Latin "Vulgate" is, for Titelmans, the translation. It would therefore seem that Trent canonized Jerome's Vulgate insofar as it corresponds to the older

usages of the Church and particularly to the most authentic "Vulgate," the Greek text of the Septuagint.

Other influences were at work in the discussion of these points. In *Il posto del 'De ecclesiasticis scriptoribus et dogmatibus' nelle discussioni tridentine* (*Éphemerides theologicae lovanienses*, vol. 25, 1949, pp. 587 ff), B. Emmi shows that Driedo's book was among the major sources that inspired this part of the decree.

The same fourth Session debated the problem of tradition. The usual interpretation, held by many Catholics as well as by Protestants, has been that Trent placed Scripture and Tradition on the same footing, as two distinct sources of faith. This interpretation needs drastic revision. As has been often noticed, the Council does not speak of "Tradition," but of "the traditions." But this is not all. Edmond Ortigues (*Écritures et traditions apostoliques au Concile de Trente*, in *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, vol. 36, 1949, pp. 271 ff) establishes, from the diaries of the Council, that the notion of two partial sources of faith, included in the first draft of the decree, was explicitly rejected from the final text after stormy debates. There is only one "source" of faith, the Revelation, which is channelled both in the Scriptures and in the apostolic traditions. The meaning of this "and" (*et*) is studied by J. R. Geiselmann (*Das Missverständnis über das Verhältnis von Schrift und Tradition und seine Ueberwindung in der katholischen Theologie*, in *Una Sancta*, September 1956, pp. 131 ff). *Et* replaced *partim partim* which, in the first draft, implied the notion of two partial sources of faith. Geiselmann follows the misinterpretation of this by subsequent theologians who read into the text of the Council a doctrine that was not there.

Session V (June 1546) is ably analysed by L. Penagos: *La doctrina del pecado original en el Concilio de Trento* (*Miscelanea Comillas*, vol. 4, 1945, pp. 127 ff). The preparation and the sense of the decree on original sin are studied in detail.

Session VI (January 1547) has

attracted the attention of the greater number of scholars. This is understandable. The decree of this session is, by its length and by its topic, the most important of the Council of Trent. The length of it may even be a hindrance to a systematic study of the debates that preceded the adoption of the final text. From 1943 to 1949 and again in 1953, Fernand Cavallera published a number of articles in *Bulletin de Littérature ecclésiastique* under the general title, *La Session VI du Concile de Trente sur la justification*. On this session this is the most exhaustive investigation of the diaries of the Council that has yet been published. But it covers only the first half of the decree. As far as it goes, however, this is an indispensable instrument for any study of justification at Trent. One can only regret that it is not frequently found in American libraries.

We have already referred to the concept of "double righteousness." In connexion with the sixth Session of the Council, this has been studied by P. Pas: *La doctrine de la double justice au Concile de Trente* (*Éphemerides theologicae lovanienses*, vol. 30, 1954, pp. 4 ff). Only the righteousness of Christ is adequate to befriend us to God. We can nonetheless reach a certain human righteousness, a sort of appeal to the righteousness of Christ. This mediates between the Lutheran imputed justice and what is commonly (though not accurately) called "synergism." Developed before the Council, it found its way into the Regensburg Book, when Melancthon and Cardinal Contarini reached a certain degree of agreement on justification. Pas shows that Seripando, General of the Augustinians, made himself the spokesman of "double righteousness" at Trent. But the sharp opposition of Diego Lainez, the Spanish Jesuit, swung the Bishops to another standpoint. The final decree ignored the idea: though not formally banned, it is clearly unfavored. A similar analysis of Seripando's attitude will be found in Hubert Jedin: *Papal Legate at the Council of Trent: Cardinal Seripando* (English ed., 1947). Jedin covers the whole

career of the great prelate, giving special attention to his frequent and influential interventions at Trent.

Do we know with the certainty of faith that we are in the good graces of God? This question was raised in the fourth session of the Council. The affirmative answer was finally condemned. But the Council was divided on whether, outside of an absolute certainty of faith, one is normally aware of the presence of grace. The pros and the cons, as they were discussed, are excellently analyzed by Adolf Stakemeier: *Das Konzil von Trient über die Heilsgewissheit* (1947). The debates lasted from July to December 1547. Stakemeier takes us through their development. He shows that the question arose, on the one hand from the diverging concepts of grace of the great Scholastics, on the other from the Lutheran and Calvinist controversies. The famed Italian Dominican Lancelot Politi Catarinus defended the awareness of grace against his Spanish colleague Dominic Soto. J. Olazarán has published a hitherto unknown text of Politi on this matter: *Fragmento de un documento conciliar catariniano* (*Archivo teológico Granadino*, vol. 16, 1953, pp. 377 ff). V. Heynck has likewise published a pamphlet on the subjective certainty of grace which circulated at the Council. This is nonetheless interesting for being due to a little known author, the Franciscan Jacob Malafossa: *Zur Kontroverse über die Gnadengewissheit auf dem Konzil von Trient* (*Fransiskanische Studien*, vol. 37, 1955, pp. 1 ff and 161 ff).

There was another Soto at Trent: Pedro de Soto, who may be mentioned here since he took part in the debates on justification. The story of his many polemics with both Protestants and Catholics is told in an enormous volume by V. D. Carro: *El Maestro Soto, las controversias teológicas y el Concilio de Trento* (1950). Pedro de Soto would deserve to be better known than he is.

The Eucharist was debated in Session XIII (October 1551). The notion of transubstantiation as upheld at Trent is commonly misunderstood.

Contrary to what is often said, it is not tied to a philosophical theory on the distinction between substance and accidents. In *El Concilio de Trento y la teoría substantia-accidentia en la Eucaristia* (*Verdad y Vida*, vol. 3, 19-45, pp. 3 ff) Miguel Oromi shows from the debates on the question that the Council gave the phrase "*accidentia sine subjecto*" a dogmatic, not a philosophical meaning. It affirms at the same time the Real Presence and the objective validity of sense-knowledge. In the theology of the Eucharist, transubstantiation thus maintains a dialectic which Aristotelian philosophy, on the contrary, would invalidate.

Session XIV (November 1551) is discussed by G. J. Spykman: *Attrition and Contrition at the Council of Trent* (1955). The author inserts his study between an outline of the history of penance and a conclusion on Calvin's theology of contrition. He touches on justification and the certainty of grace as these affect the notion of penance. He finds the Council at fault for not considering seriously the Protestant doctrines. The author is objectively fair and well-informed; yet his Calvinist point of reference is not the best to appreciate the opinions of the council fathers.

The reform of the liturgy, which was debated in Sessions XXII (September 1562) and XXV (December 1563) after being mentioned in Session IV, is studied by Hubert Jedin: *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform des Römischen Messbuches* (*Liturgisches Leben*, vol. 6, 1939, pp. 30 ff) and *Das Konzil von Trient und die Reform der liturgischen Bücher* (*Ephemerides Liturgicae*, vol. 59, 19-45, pp. 5 ff). This reform, it must be admitted, did not go very far. Yet the conservative accents of the Council's decisions were not only dictated by an anti-Protestant reaction. In spite of a number of bishops, the Council rejected the use of the vernacular for the Western liturgy. In his book *Liturgie et langue vulgaire* (French transl., 19-50) H. A. P. Schmidt analyzes the preliminary discussions of Trent on the question of the vernacular. He concludes that the final veto was not

prompted by worries about the spread of Protestant tendencies. It was due to the (to us unexpected) high regard for Latin which most of the bishops had retained from their humanistic studies. Present day advocates of a vernacular Roman liturgy could perhaps, after four centuries, turn the argument in their own favor.

One point may be concluded from this survey. The publication of the diaries of the Council has made it possible to read the conciliar decrees in a better historical light. This explains the prevailing trends of modern Tridentine scholarship: it is correcting several misinterpretations of the Council's purpose which crept into common usage during the Counter-Reformation.

VII. The Counter-Reformation. General studies.

The meaning of the expression Counter-Reformation is debatable. Some authors prefer to speak of Catholic Reform. Yet the two phrases are not always co-terminous. Hubert Jedin has tried to elucidate and distinguish the two concepts: *Katholische Reformation oder Gegenreformation?* (1946) The Council of Trent belongs to the Catholic Reform. The Counter-Reformation, though adumbrated in some tendencies before and during the Council, flourished later. A working distinction would see the Counter-Reformation as an attempt at a religious, and sometimes political, reconquest of the lands lost to Protestantism. The Catholic Reform would just be the movement of reform which started early in the sixteenth century, was hastened by the emergence of Protestantism, and received its charter, somewhat belatedly, from the Council of Trent.

In practice however the two are often studied together. For they are not easily distinguishable in concrete events. The second part of *L'Eglise à l'époque du Concile de Trente* (1948), of Léon Cristianini, gives the history of the Catholic revival, in Italy, Germany, Poland, France, Spain and, last but not least, in mission lands. Its twin volume, *La crise religieuse du XVI^e siècle* (1950, n. 16 of Fliche's *Histoire*

de l'Eglise), by E. de Moreau, P. Jourda and P. Janelle, contains the history of the Protestant Reformation together with many references to the defense of Catholicism and the beginnings of the Counter-Reformation. Both aspects are also treated, on a more popular though always well-informed, level, by Daniel-Rops: *Une ère de renouveau: la réforme catholique* (1955, vol. 6 of his *Histoire de l'Eglise du Christ*). Pierre Janelle, in *La réforme catholique* (1947) presents likewise a general outline of Catholic life in the sixteenth century, with an emphasis on the renewal of piety which followed the Council of Trent and was embodied in all fields of literature and the arts. The common trend of these authors is to stress the continuity of Catholicism before and after the Protestant upheaval. This frees them from the still frequent misconception that there was no genuine reform in Catholicism before the Council of Trent. Although his book is eminently readable, B. J. Kidd (*The Counter-Reformation*, 1933) is not always reliable in his presentation of the same movements. His rather heavy underlining of the political forces at work has somewhat left in the shadows the elements of the Catholic Reform which were not primarily anti-Protestant. The result is a rather superficial and not entirely accurate picture. On this account it is regrettable that Kidd's book has apparently become a sort of classic in many Protestant seminaries.

At the heart of the Catholic Reform was the notion of episcopacy. This it was which inspired a reform within the permanent episcopal structure of the old Church. In 1942 Hubert Jedin printed an essay on this topic (in *Sacramentum Ordinis*, a symposium offered to Cardinal Bertram). By adapting and enlarging this little known article, Paul Broutin has studied the ideal of the Bishop in the sixteenth century: *L'évêque dans la tradition pastorale du XVI^e siècle* (1953). This remarkable work takes us through the main writers of the time, from the end of the fifteenth century to Cardinal Bellarmine. Influential churchmen like Contarini and Giberti, mystics like

Luis de Grenada, irenists like Georg Witzel are surveyed. The section on episcopacy as a liturgical function, according to the *Epithalamion* of Stanislas Sokolowski, delves into a neglected aspect of the question. Charles Borromeo, the saintly Archbishop of Milan, is given due attention. He himself fulfilled the Tridentine ideal of the Bishop in famous visitations of his diocese. We are now indebted to Cardinal Angelo-Giuseppe Roncalli, Patriarch of Venice, for a scholarly publication of the acts of Borromeo's visitation of Bergamo: *Gli atti della visita apostolica di S. Carlo Borromeo a Bergamo* (4 volumes since 1936). This is an important contribution to the history of the Catholic Reform in northern Italy.

As an instance of the blend of religious and political factors in the Counter-Reformation, Pierre Cavaud's book: *La Réforme et les guerres de religion à Vienne* (1950) is worth consulting. The Vienne in question is a small city in the Rhône valley. Local politics, rivalry with the larger and Catholic city of Lyons, played their part in Vienne's turning Huguenot and in its return to Catholicism through surrender to Henry IV. This local history had wider consequences. It was the Inquisition of Vienne which investigated the case of Michael Servet, later condemned and burned by Calvin in Geneva. Pierre Cavaud has followed the Vienne part of Servet's trial, with *Le procès de Michel Servet à Vienne* (1953).

VIII. Two Religious Orders: the Jesuits, the Carmelites.

Religious Orders formed the backbone of the Catholic Reform. The Society of Jesus has naturally attracted more scholars than other Orders. It may however seem strange that the personality of St. Ignatius should have been compared both with that of Luther and with that of Calvin. Parallels of this sort are always artificial and rarely meaningful. Be that as it may, André Favre-Dorsaz has devoted 455 pages to *Calvin et Loyola: deux réformés* (1951). The author compares the youth and formation of his heroes, their writings, their qualities and prin-

ciples of leadership, and finally their destiny and influence. He repeatedly professes impartiality. Yet the overall picture concludes with the clear human and spiritual superiority of Loyola. There would be nothing to wince at in this conclusion, were it not expressed in disparaging terms. With *Martin Luther und Ignatius von Loyola, Repräsentanten zweier Geisteswelten* (1954), Friedrich Richter is infinitely respectful of the two men he studies. Written after Richter's conversion to Catholicism, this is a sort of testimony to the two religious mentalities that have successively attracted him. It does not claim the impressive scholarship of Favre-Dorsaz, but the insight it gives may be ultimately more accurate and rewarding.

Historians of the Society of Jesus have at their disposal the many volumes of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*. Among the latest we may mention vols. 63-5 (1934, 1936, 1938), which contain documents relating to the Constitutions of the Society, with a critical edition of their Latin and Spanish texts. Vol. 71, entitled *Regulae Societatis Jesu* (1948), publishes a number of rules and decisions imposed by several Superiors of the Society between 1540 and 1556. Vol. 73 (*Fontes Narrativi Sancti Ignatii*, 1951) is made up of documents concerning the life of Ignatius, written by his immediate followers. In vol. 67/8 (1944, 1945) we find the letters and some other writings of Francis Xavier. Together with this one should consult Elizabeth Gräfin Vitzthum: *Die Briefe des Francisco de Xavier* (1950), where a historical and geographical commentary accompanies the most important of Xavier's letters.

For those who cannot delve into these lengthy volumes, James Brodrick has made himself the excellent historian of the first decades of the Society. His *Origin of the Jesuits* (1946) takes us from the beginning of Ignatius's career to his death in 1556. *The Progress of the Jesuits* (1946) continues the story to the election of Ignatius's fourth successor, Claudio Aquiviva, in 1581. Brodrick has also published a *St.*

Francis Xavier (1952) and a *St. Peter Canisius* (1935). The latter is not altogether satisfactory in its treatment of Canisius's direct activity on behalf of the Counter-Reformation in Austria and Southern Germany. Protestantism is viewed in a light which is too conventionally negative.

While Ignatius was forming his Society, Spain saw the development of one of the most suggestive episodes of the Catholic Reform: the reform of the Order of Mount Carmel. There is a considerable literature on the spiritual doctrines of St. Teresa of Avila and St. John of the Cross. But this belongs to the history of spirituality rather than to the history of the Catholic Reform as such. Historians are, however, deeply indebted to the untiring work of Silverio de Santa Teresa for the fifteen volumes of his *Historia del Carmel Descalzo* (1935 to 1952). The first seven fall within our period, with four volumes on Teresa of Avila, the fifth on John of the Cross, one on Jerome Gracian and Nicolas Doria, and the seventh on the spread of the reform between 1588 and 1600. Of the more easily readable works that could be listed, Marcelle Auclair's *La vie de sainte Thérèse d'Avila* (1950) may be selected. This biography includes remarkable outlines of the entire Catholic Reform in Spain.

IX. The English Recusants.

There are but few studies on the English Recusants. These are the Catholics who refused the oath of Supremacy under Elizabeth. They were exiled or progressively persecuted if they remained in England. The Recusants left an abundant theological literature. An excellent introduction to these productions, made from a literary rather than a theological standpoint, will be found in A. C. Southern: *Elizabethan Recusant Prose* (1950). This constituted a requisite reference book for any study of Recusant writing. Southern draws a historical outline of the main controversies in which the Recusants engaged the Anglicans and provides an analysis of practically all their English writings. Latin productions, which were abundant and

important, are left aside as they do not pertain to English literature as such. From the standpoint of style, the opinion of Southern may be mentioned: the genuine continuity of English prose passes through the Recusant colonies in Douai and Reims rather than through the British Isles of those times.

Outside of this basic introduction, there is unfortunately very little concerning the Recusants. Several publications have appeared. But they have scant theological interest. The *Liber ruber venerabilis collegii Anglorum de Urbe* (ed. Wilfrid Kelly, 1940, *Catholic Record Society*, vol. 37) contains the Latin Constitution and the annals, from 1579 to 1630, of the English College in Rome, with a notice on the students. The *Letters and Memorials of Fr. Robert Persons* (vol. 1, ed. Leo Hicks, 1942, *Catholic Record Society*, vol. 39) provides a valuable edition of the correspondence of this Jesuit priest, one of the most important of the Recusant writers. These letters are useful for their allusions to contemporary events.

In connexion with Recusant literature, one may mention the interesting publication by Eusebio Rey, of the Spanish translation of Nicholas Sander's *History and Progress of the Anglican Schism: Pedro de Ribadeneyra. Historias de la Contrarreforma* (1945). Sander's Latin original was published in 1585 in Cologne. In 1588 a Spanish translation was printed in Madrid: *Historia ecclesiastica del scisma del reyno de Inglaterra*. The interest of this lies in the additions and alterations made by the translator, Pedro de Ribadeneyra, a Spanish Jesuit. They all point to the sort of "messianism" in which Spanish nationalism identified itself with the cause of the political Counter-Reformation.

No systematic study of this Recusant literature has yet been made. No monograph may be cited. Valuable references will however be found in Philip Hughes: *The Reformation in England*. The third volume (1954) makes extensive use of Recusant writings. Also by Philip Hughes: *Rome and the Counter-Reformation in Eng-*

land (1942) studies three periods of the Catholic reaction to Anglicanism, that of Cardinal Pole, that of Cardinal Allen (the Recusant period) and that of Richard Smith, Bishop of Chalcodon, in the seventeenth century.

X. Some theologians of the Counter-Reformation.

Apart from the commentators of St. Thomas and some of the great Jesuit theologians, the theology of the Counter-Reformation has not been studied very extensively. The major controversy of the times opposed Dominican and Jesuit interpreters of Aquinas on the question of the rôle of God's grace in human free acts. Molina was the spokesman of the Jesuit school. He tried to tone down the doctrine of predestination against the theories of Dominic Banez, the champion of the Dominicans. This polemic is usually known through second-hand reading. A better historical perspective will be made possible by the publication of Friedrich Stegmüller: *Geschichte des Molinismus*. The first volume: *Neue Molinaschriften* (1935) contains several theological essays, from 1563 to 1598, and some letters of Molina.

In the Counter-Reformation the theological disciplines began going their separate though related ways. Moral theology was, for good or for bad, differentiated from dogmatic theology. One of the fathers of this moral theology of modern times is the Spanish theologian Francisco de Vitoria. In *Les problèmes de la colonisation et de la guerre dans l'oeuvre de François de Vitoria* (1936), J. Baumel has contributed to our knowledge of the morality of colonialism as seen by the Spaniards of the sixteenth century. This also throws light on some of the motives that prompted the missionary efforts of the Counter-Reformation. The same scholar has published a critical edition of several writings of Vitoria on those topics: *Les leçons de François de Vitoria sur les problèmes de la colonisation et de la guerre* (1936).

Among the other theologians of the second half of the sixteenth century,

Melchior Cano has been studied by Eugène Marcotte: *La nature de la théologie d'après Melchior Cano* (1949). This prominent Thomist is credited with the first systematic treatise on the source of theological arguments, his *De locis theologicis*, posthumously published in 1564. Marcotte concentrates on the conception of theological work which is implied in Cano's *De locis*. He unfortunately neglects to investigate the sources or the influence of Cano's ideas. On Bellarmine, the great Italian Cardinal who was one of the outstanding figures of the Counter-Reformation, we have a more satisfactory work: *The Historical Scholarship of Bellarmine* (1936), by E. A. Ryan. The author broadens his basis with an opening survey of the rôle of history in the controversies of the sixteenth century. This is not exhaustive and cannot bear comparison with Polman's book. Yet it is useful. Ryan devotes most of his enquiry to an analysis of Bellarmine's knowledge and use of history in his various writings. He shows that Bellarmine was well acquainted with the past and made intelligent use of this in his polemics with the Protestants.

. . .

This survey of the most significant recent works on the Catholic Reform of the sixteenth century may end on a brief comment. Studies on the Council of Trent have been forthcoming at an impressive rate. They tend to revise former interpretations. The pre-Tridentine polemicists are also beginning to come into their own. The scope of the books that concern them is not yet very wide. Yet the increasing publication of their works renders their investigation easier.

The situation of the post-Tridentine writers is not so favorable. Yet here also are signs of a renewal of historical interest. So far most of these signs have arisen from the continent of Europe. Productions of English and especially American scholarship are few and far between. Research-workers of the English-speaking world would seem to be earmarked for suc-

cessful work in Recusant literature. Their lack of achievement in this field might be a sad witness to the intellectual abilities of Catholics in these countries if there were no Catholic scholarship in other directions. As things are, it only points to a puzzling indifference to the sort of research that requires respectful study of the Reformation.

Further investigation of the period we have surveyed would certainly yield abundant fruit for the knowledge of a major turning point in the history of Catholic theology. It would also throw light on the meaning of the Protestant Reformation, which would be better interpreted in its dialectical opposition to contemporary Catholic thinking.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"The Union Movement among Norwegian-American Lutherans 1880-1917." By E. Clifford Nelson (Luther Theological Seminary, 2375 Como Avenue, St. Paul 8, Minnesota). Yale University, 1952. Directors: S/R. Latourette, and Richard C. Wolf.

American Lutheran churches whose beginnings are to be found in the 19th century German and Scandinavian immigration have only recently undertaken the task of narrating their histories. The enormous responsibility of ministering to the large numbers of new arrivals in America and the considerable task of transplanting the Evangelical Lutheranism of Northern and Central Europe without transplanting the state-church structure of the Old World left little time for American Lutherans to reflect on the theological and sociological complexities of their history in America. After a hundred years in America, however, the Lutheran churches of the Mid-west (which received the bulk of the 19th century immigration) have begun to give serious attention to this matter.

The largest of the churches deriving from Scandinavia is the Evangelical Lutheran Church (1956 membership over 1,000,000) whose roots go back to Norway. The present dissertation relates the story of the struggle among the various Norwegian Lutheran groups in America to unite their witness in a single church body.

The congregations established in America by the Norwegians reflected the diverse religious tendencies of the homeland. Although there was but one church (the Church of Norway) in the old country, emphases deriving from the significant Haugean Revival (early 19th century) clashed with the traditional piety of the Established Church. Both viewpoints were perpetuated on the American frontier.

Low-church Haugean immigrants, led by an uneducated but earnest lay-

man, Elling Eielsen, formed the Eielsen Synod in 1846 (changed in 1876 to Hauge's Norwegian Evangelical Lutheran Synod in America). Representatives of a more traditional Lutheranism formed in 1853 what came to be known as the Norwegian Synod. Led by University-trained clergymen from Norway, the conservative Norwegian Synod found itself enamoured of the point of view held by the German Missouri Synod. Close association with the latter in the area of ministerial education soon influenced the Norwegian Synod to the point that it began to look upon itself as the sole advocate of orthodoxy among Norwegian-Americans. However, by 1870 a clearly defined third tendency appeared. Individuals who found the ecclesiastical atmosphere to left and to right intolerable sought to walk a middle way but ended up by forming two new church bodies, the Norwegian Augustana Synod and the Norwegian-Danish Conference.

Attempts to reduce the multiplicity of church groups originated in 1880. Before actual fruits of the interest in union were to be realized, the churches suffered further fragmentation when the Norwegian Synod was split over the Election Controversy of the eighties. The seceders, the so-called anti-Missourians, immediately assumed leadership in the union movement which brought the Augustanans and the Conference with the anti-Missourians, into the United Lutheran Church in America (1890).

Beginning in 1905 the three major Norwegian-American bodies (the United Church, the Norwegian Synod, and Hauge's Synod) sought to reconcile their theological, ecclesiastical, and religious differences.

Agreements were finally reached, and a union was consummated in 1917 by the formation of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America (name changed in 1946 to The Evangelical Lutheran Church).

Official reports of synodical meetings, the minutes of union committees, the Norwegian language church and secular press, theological and historical pamphlets, letters and private papers of church leaders constituted the chief sources of data for the dissertation.

"Richard Baxter's Contribution to the Comprehension Controversy: A Study in Projected Church Union." By Earl Kent Brown, Boston University School of Theology, 1956. (University Microfilms 56-2036). Director: Richard M. Cameron.

The study is an investigation of the thought and activity of Richard Baxter in the area of church union and cooperation. Three things appeared: (1) a descriptive historical survey of Baxter's thought and activity in this area; (2) the changes in Anglican usage he deemed *desirable* to achieve comprehension—i.e., the inclusion of the Puritans in the Establishment; (3) the terms he deemed the *minimum* acceptable to achieve comprehension.

(1) Baxter began his work for concord long before the Restoration. While at Kidderminster he organized the Worcestershire Association, a local society for the cooperation of ministers of diverse political, ecclesiological, and doctrinal positions. He also undertook numerous conversations with Episcopal, Independent, and Anabaptist leaders.

The Restoration threw Baxter into the forefront of negotiations for comprehension. In his writings, presented to the King and to the Savoy Conference as expressions of the Puritans' demands, we find the terms he deemed *desirable* to this end. The negotiations broke down, and some 1800 ministers were driven from the Church by the Act of Uniformity of 1662.

During long years of persecution Baxter took part in several negotiations with leaders of the Episcopal party. Full agreement was reached twice, and an Act of Comprehension was drafted for presentation to Parliament. In the bill of 1675 we find the *minimum acceptable* terms to accomplish a comprehension. These irenic

endeavors too were frustrated by certain of the higher clergy. In 1679, following the expiration of the Press Licensing Act, Baxter's pen was free once again. He published a flood of books in the next five years which involved him in a series of bitter controversies.

During the closing years of Baxter's life two proposals for greater cooperation appeared which were prepared by ministers under his influence, and which have decidedly Baxterian overtones. One of them was a plan for a comprehension recommended by an Ecclesiastical Commission of the Church of England. The second was an agreement of the Congregational and Presbyterian Nonconformists in London to cooperate with each other. Both plans failed, and Baxter's dream of one, catholic, national church in England did not materialize.

(2.) The changes in Anglican usage deemed *desirable* in order to obtain a comprehension were many and varied. On grounds of ancient church practice a system of synods, with Bishops presiding, was suggested to replace the prelatical episcopacy. On grounds of convenience extensive "Alterations and Additions" to the Prayer Book were suggested. Primarily on grounds of expedience—i.e., to satisfy the conscience of the Nonconformists—many "Exceptions" to the Prayer Book were urged.

(3) The *minimum acceptable* terms to a comprehension are found in the proposed Act of Comprehension of 1675. The bill provided for an abandonment of the oath of "assent and consent" to everything in the liturgy, made certain of the controverted ceremonies optional, and explicitly recognized the validity of non-Episcopal ordination. Until these concessions were made Baxter felt forced to remain a Nonconformist.

It will be noted that Baxter was willing to abandon many of his demands. His doctrine of the Church explains his position. For him any congregation was a true church which professed belief in the sufficiency of Scriptures and in the Gospel of Christ as revealed therein or, as summarily

expressed, in the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, and the Apostles' Creed. He was therefore willing to give up all peripheral modifications demanded in 1660-1661, if the Anglicans would give up their objectionable peripheral demands in return. These marginal matters are the "things un-

necessary" in his famed motto, "Unity in things necessary, Liberty in things unnecessary, and Charity in both." The "things necessary" in this formula are the "Fundamentals of the Faith" noted above. Baxter urgently sought union on these essentials, for he felt they constitute true Christianity.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

The Council met April 26, 1957 at the Harvard Divinity School, with the following members present: George H. Williams, Harold Grimm, Robert T. Handy, Winthrop S. Hudson.

The following persons were elected members of the Society, subject to the constitutional provision: C. FitzSimons Allison, Sidney A. Burrell, Robert B. Florian, C. C. Goen, M. Douglas Harper, Jr., Robert Hanley, Robert Hays, T. Canby Jones, Stephen Kry-salka, Harold L. Lunger, Charles S. McCoy, Richard J. McKenna, Raymond A. Peterson, Ian Rennie, William J. Richardson, J. K. Sasaki, George J. Tsoumas, J. Stafford Weeks, C. Conrad Wright.

It was voted that the list of members of the Society should be printed in the March 1958 *Church History* and that prospective members should be urged to join prior to the next meeting so that the listing will be as complete as possible. It also was voted to list the journal in the Combined Periodical Exhibit for the next meeting of the American Library Association.

The 1958 Spring Meeting will be held at Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, with Edgar M. Carlson as chairman of the program committee.

Attest:

Winthrop S. Hudson, Secretary.

BOOK REVIEWS

Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. Volumes 5 and 6. *Bread, Fish, and Wine.* By ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956. Pp. xxii + 205 + 186 illustrations; xii + 261 + 83 illustrations. \$15.00.

We have already set forth some of our enthusiasm and some of our reservations in regard to Professor Goodenough's monumental work (*Church History* Sept. 1955, p. 279; June 1954, p. 183). In the present volumes our reservations increase, largely in relation to his assumptions concerning the development of early Christianity. John is an early gospel, and "the oriental fish symbol" becomes eucharistic (V, 31); the "Pauline Eucharist... became dominant, and as it did so displaced the fish" (V, 53). The explanation, or lack of explanation, of eating fish on Fridays is based on no evidence at all, as Goodenough says (V, 45). But much of what he says can be justified by his "conviction that passing allusions imply common knowledge" (V, 85). This seems to the reviewer to be an hypothesis. He would prefer to say that *sometimes* passing allusions imply common knowledge. The long section on "the divine fluid" in various religions is certainly interesting, and in part certainly relevant to Johannine theology; but it is hard to agree (or to disagree) with the statement that the mystics, pagan or Christian, expressed "what was inherently present, even though quite unsuspected, in the minds of the ordinary... devotees" (VI, 125). "This is a hard saying" (John 6:60). So is another (VI, 220): "I have 'proved' nothing in this volume, nor can I be 'disproved'."

The general point of these volumes is that bread, fish and wine were borrowed from pagans by Jews and from Jews by Christians; and that the mystical associations of these foods were neglected by the rabbis but revived

"from Philo to the Zohar" (VI, 218), as well as in Christianity, i. e. in Catholic Christianity. Church historians may find the discussion of Tertullian's "little fish" and Judaism (V, 33-35) interesting; but they will await with especial anticipation Goodenough's further discussion of Christian symbols. For them this will raise the crucial question.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

Early Latin Theology. Translated and edited by S. L. GREENSLADE. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 415 pp. \$5.00.

This admirable collection of translations, with excellent introductory materials and notes, constitutes the fourth volume in the *Library of Christian Classics*. The theme on which they provide variations is that of the Church, its life and its doctrine. Tertullian's early work (as Greenslade well points out) *On the Prescriptions against the Heretics* is provided with illustrative material from Irenaeus and Tertullian's own *De pudicitia*; then come his *De idololatria* to illustrate the church's view of the world. From Cyprian we are given *The Unity of the Catholic Church* (with the Petrine-Roman-primacy passage in an appendix), a letter on the problem of the lapsed and two on baptism. Ambrose is represented by ten well chosen letters, and Jerome by six. Naturally, not everyone will agree that just these letters should have been chosen at the expense of others, but in view of the limitations of space it can hardly be suggested that those which do appear do not provide an ably chosen selection. A good "select bibliography" and a rather full index conclude the book.

Canon Greenslade has given us a volume well worthy of the excellent series in which it appears.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

The Classics and Renaissance Thought. By PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER. (Martin Classical Lectures. Vol. XV). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955. viii, 106 pp. \$2.50.

I am instructed to review Professor Kristeller's book with an eye on its pertinence for church history. Anyone interested in the Reformation can profit from careful reading of each of its hundred-odd pages. This can be argued from the very fact that the setting of the Reformation was in the Renaissance era and that the general preoccupation of scholars with the classics was shared by most Reformers. The regard of the Reformers for the authority of Scripture and the Fathers was the counterpart of the regard in which the humanists held the Latin and Greek literature; indeed it is hard to believe that both were not related to the same mental set. For both humanists and Reformers the "purer age" lay in antiquity. It is not to deny the uniqueness of the Reformation as to religious experience and faith to say that some of its more important aspects are characteristic of Renaissance humanism. Thus from a proper understanding of the subject matter of this book one can harvest much in interpreting the Reformation.

What has just been said might justify reviewing the entire volume. However, only the fourth or last lecture ("Paganism and Christianity") deals explicitly with our special concern, and so we turn directly to it. This lecture is aimed first at refuting the notion that the Italian Renaissance and Italian humanism are identifiable "with some kind of irreligion" which "the Protestant and Catholic Reformation . . . challenged and finally defeated" (p. 71). The facts do not bear this out. In the Middle Ages there was a considerable concern with this world, and also with pagan literature. During the Renaissance "nonreligious concerns that had been growing for centuries" were expanded and "attained a kind of equilibrium with religious and theological thought, or even began to surpass it in vitality and appeal." Yet the Renaissance remained a "fundamental-

ly Christian age," for the religious convictions of Christianity were "never really challenged" (p. 73). Indeed Christianity survived the Middle Ages, but it also was affected by the changes in the Renaissance period. It could "cease being medieval in many respects and yet remain Christian," as is "apparent in the new doctrines and institutions created by the Protestant and Catholic Reformations" (p. 74).

The role of the humanists in bringing about these changes was considerable. The humanists were professional people, not intent upon either maintaining or opposing Christian theology. "The way they brought their humanistic training to bear upon the source material and subject matter of Christian theology" was an important factor in bringing about the changes in Christianity; such were "the attack upon scholastic method and the emphasis upon the return to the classics, which in this case meant the Christian classics, that is, the Bible and the Church Fathers" (p. 75). After some pages describing the history of theology the author says: "This return to the Bible and patristic sources . . . meant that these sources, which after all were the product of antiquity, . . . shared the prestige and authority of classical antiquity, and to [them] the same methods of historical and philological scholarship could be applied" (p. 78). This scholarship was practiced by Valla and Erasmus. Humanists also added considerably to the availability in Latin of the Greek Fathers. The Fathers whose Latin fell in the classical period were recommended by humanist educators for reading. Beginning with Valla, church history received critical treatment. All this new kind of study of the Bible and the Fathers—particularly St. Augustine—produced new emphases in theology. Finally, "Christian humanism" is defined, for which one should read every line of pp. 86 and 87.

In a perfect work the loose stitch is conspicuous. The adjective "novel" is attached to some things in Augustine (p. 76), which later are better said to be "formulated or sharpened" (p. 83). In note 14, p. 77, the

reference to E. Gilson can be interpreted as being of the same mind with C. N. Cochrane and H. A. Wolfson, which is certainly not intended by the writer. On p. 41, lines 25 and 26 are reversed.

The book is a gem. It is hard to be brief about it, for the writer says so much in so little. A Renaissance many-sidedness marks its scholarship. The style is a clean window. Professor Kristeller practices a precept he has always preached, to wit, that one must beware of generalizations. Concerning no era have men made more sweeping statements than the era of the Renaissance and Reformation. *Verbum sat sapienti.*

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon

Epîtres du Coq à L'ane. By HENRI MEYLAN. Travaux D' Humanisme et Renaissance XX. Genève: Librairie E. Droz, 1956. xxviii, 130 pp.

The letters of the cock to the ass constituted in the sixteenth century a literary genre of satirical verse. The device, if not actually originated by Clement Marot, is associated with his name and this new collection discovered chiefly in manuscript by Professor Meylan makes even more prominent his role in creating and popularizing the style. The expression, "Coq à l'ane," comes from the proverb "to jump from the cock to the ass" and means to proceed without rhyme or reason. Marot and his school played with the idea by composing letters from the cock to the ass, and replies. Then by expansion there were letters from the capon to the cock or from the poulet (which sounds better in French, "coquette à coq") or from the cock to the rabbit or the goat. In fact the proverb itself is made to jump from the cock to the ass. The very treatment of the idea suggests nonsense, but it is barbed nonsense. This is the French variety of the pasquinade, so popular in Italy for the lampooning of ecclesiastics, including the Pope. The French variety is derived from and related to the Italian, and Meylan here demonstrates the existence of French pasquinades. One of the items in this

collection is entitled *Epistre de Pasquille de Romme aux Jeuneux de Paris*. The content of this literature is in part a revival of medieval jibes, but is extended to serve as a weapon of the Huguenot Reform. The verses have reference by name to Luther and Melancthon, with cracks at the obscurantism of the Sorbonne. There are rumblings in particular of the controversies over indulgences, purgatory and the mass. Events of the French Reformation naturally invite mention, such as the affair of the Placards and the execution of the Quatorze de Meaux. Apropos of the irreverent reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, the editor grants that one might be astonished at such boldness only five years after the consternation occasioned by the appearance of the work of Servetus, were it not that Claude Chappuis, dean of the cathedral at Rouen, had been guilty of the like, though to be sure his remark was not printed during his lifetime. That heresy should be visited with the stake and blasphemy go unscathed is however not so remarkable. In the Middle Ages there were blasphemous parodies of the mass for which, to my knowledge, no one was ever burned.

These satirical poems are provided by the editor with copious notes without which few readers would be able to find their way around. All in all, this collection adds greatly to our store of *Flugschriften* of the French Reformation.

ROLAND H. BAINTON

Yale Divinity School

Tudor and Stuart Lincoln. By J. W. F. HILL. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956. xiv, 254 pp. \$6.00.

Lincoln in these years was a decayed town. It had perhaps half as many inhabitants as there were at the Norman Conquest. Its wool trade was gone, its waterways clogged, its bourgeoisie shrunk. The bishopric had fallen from one of the richest in England to a mere stepping stone for ambitious prelates; and the city's splendid inheritance of brick and stone must have hung like a millstone around the necks

of impoverished deans, churchwardens, and burgesses. Yet life went on. We can see how a living was wrung from the expenditures of the Close, the bench, the local farmers and the neighboring gentry; how gallant efforts were fitfully made; and how there was even a net gain in population and wealth if we compare 1700 with 1500.

Decayed towns deserve their historians as well as thriving ones, and Mr. Hill would have written a better book if he had made decay his theme. Unfortunately this history has no theme and a very defective organization. Some vital particulars, like the basic topography, or the fate of the castle, the Close, and the open fields, have to be ferreted out of the author's previous volume, *Mediaeval Lincoln*. This volume has neither beginning nor end; and the purely chronological treatment should have been diversified, as it was in the earlier volume, with topical chapters. The recurring attempts to restore the Fossdyke, as an arterial waterway between Lincoln and the Trent, or the efforts to cope with the problem of poverty, cry aloud for unified treatment.

Regrets may be carried further. A city has a structure of markets, occupations, classes, functionaries; these things have a history of continuity or change; and they can be seen in perspective by comparing one city with another. But in none of these dimensions of urban history—the static, the dynamic, and the comparative—does Mr. Hill do more than whet our curiosity.

Students of church history will find a conventional treatment of the incidents of the Reformation in Lincoln—the dissolution of religious houses, puritanism, recusancy, disestablishment, and dissent. But here again there is a curious unevenness in the slight attention given to the cathedral. Non-residence might be a reason for saying little about the bishops, but why not more about the personalities and politics of the Close?

Yet these are failures of imagination in an otherwise useful work. One often feels that Mr. Hill could have produc-

ed the answer if he had only known what question to ask. He is a public-spirited solicitor who has had a life-long interest in the history of his city—as businessman, mayor, and close friend of scholars. He knows his archives; carefully documents his tale; and gives us, with the aid of the Cambridge Press, a well-printed, well-illustrated volume. If it is in some ways more a work of reference than of art, and closer to the old local history than the new, it still deserves our gratitude. People who fill the intervals of busy lives with labors of historical love are surely among our friends.

ALAN SIMPSON

University of Chicago

The Royalists during the Puritan Revolution. By PAUL H. HARDACRE. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956. 185 pp. 11.50 guilders.

This work is a detailed, well documented, authoritative account of the increasing difficulties of Charles I's supporters in their ineffectual struggle with the Long Parliament and, more especially, of the conditions imposed upon them in defeat, in exile, and in their more or less surreptitious resistance at home under the Commonwealth and Protectorate. It is the story of a revolutionary regime ineffectually seeking acceptance as the established legitimate government in church and state and having to rely more and more upon the use of force to maintain its position in the face of divided and increasingly hostile public opinion. It is the kind of story which has become again unhappily familiar to us in the twentieth century. Like so much of the history of the Puritan Revolution it is of particular interest to students of church history because the church in its increasingly divergent manifestations provided the viable ideas, the expressive images, and the social instrumentalities for the development of articulate public opinion as an incalculable force in the state which rulers of the state would henceforth have to reckon with. The interest of Mr. Hardacre's book lies partly in the fact that here we see the Anglican clergy in

the unaccustomed role of underdog, responding however to their predicament in a manner not unlike that of their Puritan opponents in the same situation. In his third chapter Mr. Hardacre shows us what happened to the episcopal clergy as with the defeat of the king they were progressively extruded from their posts or compelled to conform as best they might to the new dispensation. A later chapter deals with the part played by the clergy as the revolutionary government in its successive stages vainly endeavored to reassemble some likeness of a church establishment under its own control. Thus the book helps usefully to fill the gap in our information between Christopher Hill's recent *Economic Problem of the Church from Whitgift to the Long Parliament* and R. S. Bosher's *Making of the Restoration Settlement*. The church establishment at the beginning of the Puritan Revolutionary crisis still represented an important block of capital wealth and of patronage to be exploited and manipulated by whomsoever could make himself master of the state. The masters of power in the state helped themselves to the resources of the church precisely as their predecessors had done at least as far back as Henry VIII. As the Puritans turned the tables on the Anglicans, many of the clergy with Anglican sympathies held on to their posts and showed themselves as fertile in devices for evading control over their activities as Puritan lecturers ever had done. Religious leaders on both sides functioned as leaders and exponents of conflicting ways of thinking about political issues. Religious aspirations were inextricably involved in secular interests. All parties were agreed that national unity was impossible without religious uniformity, but they found themselves increasingly unable to agree in religion about anything else. Secular rulers consequently drew ever nearer to the common-sense realization that the only hope of attaining political stability lay in a policy of toleration and comprehension supported by the state even if resting upon indifference to religious issues. This was the policy toward which Cromwell was moving

when death intervened to postpone the disposition of the whole matter to the eighteenth century.

WILLIAM HALLER
Folger Library, Washington, D. C.

Geschichte des Protestantismus in Österreich. By GRETE MECENSEFFY. Graz—Köln: Hermann Böhlau's Nachfolger, 1956. viii, 232 pp. DM. 14.80

The need for a modern territorial history of Austrian Protestantism has been felt for a long time by everyone informed. True, there existed an older elaborate work by Georg Lösche on the same topic (3rd ed. 1930), covering more than 800 pages, but its orientation and organization was antiquated even from the beginning. It was broken up into the local histories of the several countries of the former Austrian Monarchy (prior to 1918), including Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and so on, and lacked any clear overall view concerning the vicissitudes of the Lutheran Church in these Habsburg territories. [The Reformed Church hardly entered the area before the nineteenth century.] It had very little to say about the heroic story of the "underground" church of the period between 1620 and 1781, what today is fittingly termed *Geheimprotestantismus*, and in general offered no modern historical viewpoints of any kind. In short a re-interpretation of this interesting subject has been overdue almost since the establishment of the new Republic of Austria in 1918. And this is true all the more as the young Republic became more and more conscious of its particular place in history and culture, quite independent of former ties and connections with countries outside its own territories.

This task has now been fulfilled most satisfactorily by the volume under review. Dr. Grete Mecenseffy, who gained her historical training at the "Österreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung," (University of Vienna), and is now Lecturer (*Dozent*) in Church History at the Divinity School (*Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät*) of the University of Vienna, has met

her task in a superb way, giving a full-rounded picture of the destinies of Protestantism in the territory of the Republic of Austria, its success and defeat, and second success at the end of a long internal struggle with Catholic Habsburg governments. This book of 225 pages offers pleasant and stimulating reading with many an interesting detail woven in as to persons and movements; it is well documented, using the latest research in this field, and manages to make good sense out of the often chaotic conditions. Any break-up in sectional history is avoided as far as possible even though one notices a certain predilection of the author for Upper-Austria and the cities of Linz, Steyr and Freistadt, well-known strongholds of defiant Lutheranism. If there is anything to be regretted then it is the lack of pictorial illustrations (of which, we are certain, there is a plenty available); apparently this is due in the main to the difficulties of financing such a publication and making it a publishing success.

Austria, the ancient Eastern March of the Holy Roman Empire, was always more or less marginal to the main cultural streams of German civilization, defending it more than contributing to it. Nevertheless, when in Germany Protestantism arose and spread like a prairie fire, Austria proved also most receptive to these religious innovations from Wittenberg, in the main most likely due to the unbelievable weakness and corruption of the Roman Church. All social classes alike, lords, burghers and peasants, quickly embraced the new teachings with enthusiasm and as an expression of their civic liberties. At some periods of the sixteenth century about seven-eighths of the population in the Habsburg Domain had become Lutheran. This is doubly remarkable as Austria never produced any outstanding leader, theologian, or any creative contribution to church life. Still, the old feudal organization and the pride of the new urban classes proved formidable forces against all attempts at recatholicization. After the death of the "tolerant" Emperor Maximilian II

(said to have leaned toward Protestantism himself), the counter-reformatory activities strongly intensified; their most outstanding representative was Melchior Khlesls, a onetime Protestant and after 1616 Cardinal, the councilor of two emperors. Still, the Protestants skillfully profited from the predicament of the Habsburgs, Turkish attacks and internal troubles in Bohemia, and thus reached a second flowering between 1609 and 1618, shortly before the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. All that is told by Dr. Mecenseffy with great expertness and warmth, adding details wherever feasible. The sporadic rise of Anabaptism in Tyrol and other territories is treated in a separate chapter with great understanding, an innovation indeed in a Protestant church history. By 1540/50, however, Anabaptism had almost died out in face of ruthless persecution, to carry on successfully only in adjacent Moravia and Slovakia, areas no longer within the scope of the book.

The tragic downfall and near annihilation of Lutheranism during the Thirty Years' War is again told in detail, being followed by the well-nigh unknown story of the Austrian *Geheimprotestantismus* at the time of imperial absolutism and its correlated principle of governmentally dominated state-church. This is perhaps the best and most enlightening part of the book, a report of encouraging loyalty to the Protestant principle of Bible-centered Christianity, in spite of externally enforced church conformity. The tragic story of the Salzburg exiles (1731) is told within the wider context of church history; the name Joseph Schaitberger (of Salzburg origin) is of course widely known due to his popular *Evangelischer Sendbrief* of 1686, Austria's main contribution to the budding Pietism. Less known is the story of the Carinthian transmigrants (to Transylvania, 1752-6) and the story of the settlement of 250 Salzburg Lutheran emigrés in Ebenezer, Ga., 1734. In 1776, the first governor of the new state of Georgia was a descendant of this group.

At long last, in 1781, toleration for

all non-Catholics came also to Austria, due to the enlightened attitude of Joseph II. It ushered in a period of ascendancy and development to full legal equality of the two churches, Catholic and Lutheran, or as it is called in Austria "Evangelical Church A.B." To it has now to be added also the "Evangelical Church H. B." (Helvetic Confession), though only of modest extension. All in all, it is a remarkable story of faith and courage, proving the penetrating power of the Protestant principle of evangelicalism wherever it can take a foothold. We certainly welcome a study of this kind and wish the book many an interested reader also on this side of the ocean. It should also be mentioned that the book contains a good deal of original research which the author carried out in many a remote archive and library.

ROBERT FRIEDMANN

*Western Michigan College
Kalamazoo, Michigan*

The Politics of English Dissent. By RAYMOND G. COWHERD. New York: New York University Press, 1956. 242 pp. \$5.00.

Both historians and church historians are familiar with the first and second phases of the alliance of English Nonconformity with, respectively, the left-wing of the Commonwealth and Protectorate and the Whig party from 1688 to 1837. The Associate Professor of History at Lehigh University has turned his attention to the lesser known third phase, which he records and evaluates under the sub-title of "The Religious Aspects of Liberal and Humanitarian Reform Movements from 1815 to 1848."

His well-documented narrative (18 pages of bibliography to 167 of text and 46 of notes) retells the formidable achievements of a single generation: the expansion of religious liberty, the beginning of national elementary education, the widening of the basis of parliamentary franchise, the shortening of the factory day, the freeing of trade restrictions, were the chief of them, if the prevention of revolution of the French type were not the pre-eminent accomplishment.

The confused picture of various denominational enthusiasms and philanthropies has been considerably clarified by Dr. Cowherd's analysis, in which he draws a distinction between the liberal and humanitarian accomplishments in the political and social areas. The liberal movement resulted in the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, the Reform Bill of 1832, and the repeal of the Corn laws, while enabling the middle and working classes to share more freely in local (and, to a lesser degree, in national) government. In these achievements the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the less conservative branches of Methodism (not the Wesleyan Methodists), and the Unitarians, have pride of place. The humanitarianism which produced such reforms as slave emancipation, factory legislation, and elementary education, was nourished by the Evangelical Revival, and the work chiefly of the "Clapham Sect" (the Anglican Evangelicals under Wilberforce), the Wesleyan Methodists, and the Society of Friends.

The author makes the suggestion, with good support, that both types of reforms owe much to the techniques of John Wesley, whose doctrine of universal salvability provided the motive and the compassion of these reforms, and whose travelling preachers, with their tracts, were the models for the passionately righteous and indignant lecturers who desired to educate the often passive victims of the manufacturers in the "dark Satanic mills" or of the aristocratic landlords, both spiritual and temporal.

The persevering reader will find this a fair book, critical of both the emotionalism of the demagogues and the fear of some and the sheer inertia of other Tories, and one that is illuminating on the tactical approaches of the Dissenters. The reviewer found particularly fascinating the account of the short-lived "Chartist Churches" and the astonishing alliance of Dissent with the Benthamite Radicals.

In so concentrated a book, it might appear captious to appeal for more information, but that is the measure of the appetite the author has created in

the reader. It is certainly to be hoped that Dr. Cowherd will take the story further.

Meantime, if a deserved second edition is called for, it might be well for Dr. Cowherd to list the individual contributions made by the varied denominations and not to lump them together as "Dissenters." Also he has rather narrowly limited the abolition of the slave trade to the West Indies, to the exclusion of Southern Africa, and the remarkable work there of Dr. John Philip, the Director for thirty years of the London Missionary Society stations, who was deservedly known as "the Wilberforce of Africa." Finally, there are errors in the date of the founding of the pioneer Baptist Missionary Society and in the title of Doddridge's greatest work.

HORTON DAVIES

Princeton University

Count Zinzendorf. By JOHN R. WEINLICK. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 240 pp. \$4.75.

If one does not count translations, this is, as the dust-jacket tells us, the first biography in English of Count Zinzendorf, the ecumenical prophet of the 18th century and renewer of the Moravian Church.

As straight biography and introduction to one of the key lives in world Christianity, it is adequate. The story of the warm-hearted pietist whose hopes of bringing separate Christian churches into a spiritual fellowship foreshadowing the union movements of the 20th century, his genius for organization, his explosive yet germinative American visit of 1741-1743, his Roman Catholic contacts as seen in his friendship with the Cardinal de Noailles, his direction of the Moravian mission in the Old and the New World, all are told adequately. Less savory aspects of Moravian life such as the outbreak of erotic mysticism in the "Sifting Period" of the 1740's are treated with enlightenment, without, however, reference to the psychological literature on the subject or citation of the medieval parallels to Moravian emotionalism. As a gen-

eral treatment of Moravianism centered in the life of Zinzendorf the book will be welcomed by laymen and beginning students in church history as the only readily available English biography.

For the scholar the volume has less to offer. There is very little critical apparatus. There is no bibliography. Footnoting is limited to direct quotations. In the notes, author and title are given, without further bibliographical data, as for instance (page 19): "*Büdingische Sammlungen*, translated by F. F. Hagen, *Old Landmarks*, p. 120." — which is inexcusable in the absence of any sort of bibliography or bibliographical essay at the end of the volume. In the absence also of a foreword explaining the book's purpose and method, we are inclined to lay the blame for the faulty critical apparatus, in what is otherwise a good biography, not on the author, but upon the editorial board of the Abingdon Press, whose taste is evident as well in the second-hand, wooden line-drawings which illustrate the text. With the exception of the frontispiece, which is a photographic reproduction of an 18th century portrait of the count, the text-drawings, mechanical 20th century copies, give little indication of either the esthetic charm or the historical importance of the Moravian drawings and paintings as portraiture and folk-art.

True to its character of "straight biography," the book ends with the burial of the count in 1760. A final chapter on Zinzendorf's place in the history of the Christian movement, both in its missionary and ecumenical aspects, would have been valuable for the level of reader for whom the book seems to be intended—a chapter which would analyze that fascinating transatlantic and interdenominational criss-cross of 18th century Pietism, Moravianism, and Methodism from the standpoint of 20th century scholarship.

A bibliographical essay on Zinzendorf literature would also have been helpful. There is no reference in the book to the more recent continental contributions on Zinzendorf, such as

Gösta Hök's *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion* (Uppsala, 1948), Fritz Blanke, *Zinzendorf und die Einheit der Kinder Gottes* (Basel, 1950), the *Zinzendorf-Gedenkbuch*, edited by Ernst Benz and Heinz Renkewitz (Stuttgart, 1951), Otto Uttendörfer's *Zinzendorf und die Mystik* (Berlin, 1952), and Friedrich Gärtner's *Karl Barth und Zinzendorf* (Munich, 1953).

Perhaps with the increase of interest in Zinzendorf as an ecumenical leader, and the approach of the bicentennial of his death in 1960, Dr. Weinel, who is Professor of Historical Theology at the Moravian Theological Seminary at Bethlehem, will enlighten his first circle of readers further on these matters.

DON YODER.

The University of Pennsylvania.

Delinquent Saints: Disciplinary Action in the Early Congregational Churches of Massachusetts. By EMIL OBERHOLZER, JR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956. x, 379 pp. \$6.00.

Although C. F. Adams, H. B. Parkes, and E. Morgan touched on certain phases of church discipline in their writings on Massachusetts, no systematic study of the whole range of disciplinary action has ever been made. This study, a revised Ph.D. dissertation from Columbia, apparently under the direction of Professor R. B. Morris, attempts to fill this gap. Beginning with an essay on moral and domestic life among Puritans, the theme was expanded to include all acts of discipline and, at the same time, contracted to those cases mentioned in the extant records of the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies. Probably no people in the nation have revered their ancestors more than the people of Massachusetts, but this did not deter them from removing or expunging unsavory items from church records. The bibliography shows that the author personally examined the records of about one hundred churches and found less than a dozen complete enough either for statistical purposes or to suggest trends.

The churches categorized the sins for which disciplinary action was necessary under generous interpretations of the ten commandments. In this they echoed Calvin, and Oberholzer loosely follows this same arrangement in his chapter distribution. The fundamental problem was how to restore the covenanted saint who had strayed into sin. As Congregationalism had no Calvinistic system of courts, it was necessary for the church itself to step in, censure the sinner, and for his own good to excommunicate him if unrepentant. The purpose of excommunication was to bring the sinner to repentance, and in an extraordinary number of cases considered by the author, this was accomplished. Often the confession was tendentious or mechanical, but again and again we read that after ten or eighteen or even thirty years some person ate humble pie and was restored to fellowship. A humble confession could unlock the most difficult case of discipline. Remarkable too is the fact that the churches respected neither wealth nor rank in these matters.

By mere numerical count Oberholzer proves what was suggested long ago by Adams, that offences against the seventh commandment were more numerous than any other. As a matter of technicality it was not adultery but fornication that was the chief sin of the members of the Massachusetts churches. And as always women were the scapegoats, for "motherhood is hard to conceal... fatherhood difficult to prove." Under the eighth commandment—thou shalt not steal—runaway slaves were censured. Curiously enough, the churches felt that a runaway slave was stealing himself from his master. In regard to card playing and allied sins, the Puritans regarded gambling as the tempting of God's providence. "The very acts of shuffling, cutting, and dealing cards contained the elements of a lottery." Man was only the accidental cause of the distribution of the cards, any particular combination was part of God's providence. This was construed as taking the name of God in vain.

The author attempts, without success, to correlate church discipline with the Great Awakening. The records are too fragmentary and there are too many intangibles to say whether or not the moral tone of the churches improved during the revivals. It is possible to say, however, that the Great Awakening was a leavening agent which helped break down the old system of church discipline.

After the revolutionary war church discipline fell into disuse. Oberholzer shows that there was a dying gasp in the latter years of the eighteenth century in a sharp increase of censure for alcoholism and absenteeism. He suggests that the first was the result of the changing standard from temperance to abstinence (this is the period when Congregational Churches switched from wine to grape juice in the sacrament) and the second the result of religious freedom and toleration. The last recorded confession for fornication was in 1849; the last excommunication for adultery in 1854; and the last recorded incident of church discipline occurred at Stockbridge in 1872, apparently for operating a house of ill-fame.

It would be interesting to know whether excommunication takes place today in Congregational Churches. The forms of church discipline have never been repealed; they are still in the manuals and in church by-laws. From time to time one hears rumors of a disciplinary action but, I suspect, that in this as in many other things, Congregationalism has departed from the ways of its seventeenth century founders. One of the few criticisms one can make of this volume is the hesitancy of the author to interpret his material or to draw general statements from the isolated incidents.

VERNE D. MOREY.

Fort Kent, Maine.

Constrained by Jesus' Love: An Inquiry into the Motives of the Missionary Awakening in Great Britain in the Period between 1698 and 1815. By JOHANNES VAN DEN BERG. Kampen: J. H. Kok n.v., 1956. ix, 238 pp. F6. 90.

This book is a dissertation presented for the degree of "Doctor in de Godgeleerheid" at the Theologische Hogeschool at Kampen in the Netherlands. It has the usual form of a European dissertation, which is somewhat irritating to American readers, but it more than compensates for this by being written in English and thus being available to a wide reading public. There is some stiffness of style and infelicity of expression, but the book is a commendable piece of writing for one who is not composing in his own mother tongue. The author has made an important contribution to the history of Protestant mission theory, or missiology as he would say, at a time when the illumination of the past is of the utmost importance in the effort to define anew the meaning of world mission.

The term "motives" is to be understood as meaning those "impelling forces which stand behind the missionary awakening as a whole." The study is limited to Great Britain because the awakening there developed a character of its own, distinct from the Continent of Europe.

The author presents a brief and useful survey of early Protestant mission thinking and activity before 1698 and 1701, in which years respectively there were formed the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The organization of these two Anglican enterprises marks, in the opinion of the author, the beginning of the awakening. He credits this development to the influence of the "Religious Societies," which combined the heritage of Puritanism with German Pietism, and to the personal work of Thomas Bray, who had been affected by Leibniz and Francke. However, it seems to this reviewer that the formation of the New England Company in 1649 might better be considered as the beginning, since the S. P. C. K. and the S. P. G., as the author himself shows, were not primarily missionary but pastoral in relation to the overseas colonists and troops. Dissenting and Scottish beginnings are traced.

The strongest motives of the period were ecclesiastical and cultural,—the extension of Anglican and other British churches and culture,—but love and compassion were strong stimuli, and the eschatological element was not lacking. Political influence also played a part. However, it was out of the Methodist Movement and the Great Awakening that a powerful and permanent foreign missionary interest developed and took organizational form. The romantic appeal of far off places and new colonies played a part in this, but the inner compulsion of the Holy Spirit, the desire for the salvation of souls, and the advancement of the Kingdom were far more influential.

Van Den Berg characterizes the period from 1792 to 1813 as the time of "the Great Break-Through of the Missionary Movement." During these years the Baptist Missionary Society, the Methodist Missionary Society, the London Missionary Society, and the Church Missionary Society were organized. (The Methodist Missionary Society claims 1786 as its beginning.) Henceforth British missions were an ever greater force in the life of the churches. Obedience to the missionary command of Christ now takes its place among the dominant motives, along with a passion for the salvation of souls and the advancement of the Kingdom. Excepting for the older Anglican societies, church extension was not a major factor. Perhaps political and humanitarian motives should be given a larger place than the author allows.

The historical analysis presented in the first four chapters follows an irritatingly obvious, repetitious, and rigid outline, probably due to the requirements of a Dutch Th.D. thesis; and, although the mechanics of the outline are still too obtrusive, the comprehensive and more extended study of "Human Motives and the Divine Motive" in the final large chapter is most welcome. Here the author ranges from the Middle Ages to the present moment, presenting a broad background for his treatment of the ideas of the eighteenth century. Empirical motives, such as the extension of the *corpus christianum*, the compulsion of love, joyful obedience, asceticism, and ecclesiology are confronted with the teaching of the Bible under such headings as "Corpus Christianum and the Dominion of Christ in this World," "Human Compassion and Divine Love," "Command and Sacrifice," and "Ekklesia and Basileia." Missionary work can rest only on the command, the will, and love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. An over-emphasis on any one secondary motive has always produced faulty methods and wrong objectives.

The footnotes are extremely valuable, and so is the bibliography, although it would be better if the publishers were indicated. There is an index of persons, but the addition of an index of subjects would have made the book more useful as a reference tool.

R. PIERCE BEAVER.

University of Chicago.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD

Wayfaring Witness

Stuart C. Henry

A scholarly yet readable biography of the controversial 18th century evangelist who was one of the most important figures in America's Great Awakening. George Whitefield, British by birth, came to America seven times and is buried at Newburyport, Massachusetts. This is an enthralling, colorful account of a man who was called both devil and saint, who rose from obscurity to international prominence. \$3.75

UNDER THE STEEPLE

Dorothy and Gabriel Fackre

This book reveals the church in terms of its common-interest groups—or *clans*—who characterize it and perpetuate its life. These clans perform the fragmentary activities of the church such as the pulpit, classroom, communion table, fellowship hall, or scoutroom. All church members will better understand the joys and sorrows of parish life after reading this concise explanation of the church. \$2.00

UNDERSTANDING GRIEF

Edgar N. Jackson

This book aids the minister and counselor in discovering new ways to help the bereaved make the adjustment to environment safely and creatively. By examining the roots, dynamics, and treatment of grief, Mr. Jackson shows *how* the grief-stricken can be restored to useful living. "This is a badly needed book."—Dr. Wayne Oates, Professor of Psychology of Religion, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. \$3.50

AT ALL BOOKSTORES

Publisher of
THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE



abingdon press



THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

The ablest writers from many denominations . . . an original and unique working plan . . . texts in both King James and Revised Standard versions . . . rich introductions . . . authoritative exegeses . . . stimulating expositions . . . other exciting features—all these are found in each of the 12 volumes of *THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE*.

Volume 12 (published this fall) completes the set! It contains complete texts and commentary on James through Revelation, PLUS 16 pages of color photographs, general articles, and two indexes to the entire set.

Christendom's Most Comprehensive Commentary

Each volume, \$8.75



AT ALL BOOKSTORES
Abingdon Press

"A thorough and illuminating study."

—ROLAND H. BAINTON, author of *Yale and the Ministry*

The Great Awakening in New England

By EDWIN SCOTT GAUSTAD

• A complete and detailed study of revivalism in the American colonies in the mid-1700's. Never before has this particular epoch of our religious life been so thoroughly researched from the sociological, theological, and historical points of view. In **THE GREAT AWAKENING IN NEW ENGLAND**, Dean Gaustad demonstrates, in the light of today's tremendous interest in revivalism, that the spiritual upheaval in New England was "the most significant cultural phenomenon in American colonial history."

• "A distinguished piece of scholarship which needed to be done, and will not need to be done again in our lifetime."—WILLIAM W. SWEET, author of *The Story of Religion in America*. \$3.00

"Walter Rauschenbusch was the greatest single personal influence on the life and thought of the American church in fifty years."—HENRY PITNEY VAN DUSEN.

A Rauschenbuch Reader

Compiled by BENSON Y. LANDIS

With an interpretation of the career of
Walter Rauschenbusch by
Harry Emerson Fosdick

• Though constantly quoted and referred to, the works of Walter Rauschenbusch are all out of print today. In this new volume, Benson Landis has collected and culled Rauschenbusch's most pertinent passages in the light of today's interest, and Dr. Fosdick has assessed his permanent position from the vantage point of a vastly changed era. The collection includes many of Rauschenbusch's remarkable addresses, much of his social thought, and his memorable prayers and collects.

• "The real founder of social Christianity in this country . . . its most brilliant and generally satisfying exponent to the present day."—REINHOLD NIEBUHR. \$3.00

At your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS • N. Y. 10

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB ST
ANN ARBOR, MICH